THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THIS is not a "Poor Germany" book. It has not been written either to insist that the German people are better than you may have thought, or to belabour—for the satisfaction of the "All-Germans-are-Nazi" school—the popular thesis that they are even worse than was imagined'; these are the opening words of the Preface to *The Rebirth of the German Church*,[1] by the Rev. Stewart HERMAN. If the writer has any bias it may be expressed in the words of Martin Niemöller: 'no peace can endure that does not leave a hope of survival to the vanquished.'

The author is well-fitted to write a book on this theme. He was minister of the American Church in Berlin up till Pearl Harbour brought America into the War. He continued his relations with the German Church and re-entered Germany within a month of the Allied entry into Berlin. From then on he has been engaged in helping in the rehabilitation of German Church life and in re-establishing relations between the Churches of the world and those in Germany. He has been, and is, in close contact with the leaders of the German Churches, and has travelled thousands of miles within Germany in recent months by plane, jeep, and train.

The tragedy of the German Church is that millions of nominal Christians, secretly gratified perhaps by the Austrian *anschluss* and other political successes, decided to preserve their silence and their skins. It is they who are most likely to say to-day: 'What could we do?' The glory of the German Church is that a courageous minority, armed with little more than the sword of the Spirit, joined hands against hopeless odds and persevered, despite all accusations of treason, in the midst of total war, as soldiers of God. Most, but not all, of this minority belonged to the Confessing Church.

[1] S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net.

The Confessing Church recognizes to-day that it had one duty during the War and has another now. During the War its task was Defence. It was engaged in defending its Christian convictions against the spiritual arrogance of a Fascist ideology as incorporated in a totalitarian dictatorship. To-day its business is Reconstruction—to gather the pieces of the divided Christian community for the religious rehabilitation of the nation. 'Now it is no longer our first duty,' says Dibelius, 'to divide ourselves from others, but to co-operate with others in the moulding of a Church.'

Outsiders are apt to belittle the witness of the Confessing Church in Germany during the War. This book will open many eyes to the spectacle of heroism and fidelity to conviction on the part of many to the point of oppression, starvation and death. The Confessing witness began as early as 1934 when German pastors refused to subscribe to the Nazi doctrine of total obedience to the State and declared their position in the words of the earliest Christians: 'We must obey God rather than men.' Two thousand ministers rallied to the call of Niemöller and aligned themselves in an Emergency Union. This scattered group gave birth to the Confessional Church which bore the brunt of the ensuing struggle against the perversion of the Christian Faith into a purely Nazi religion.

This struggle naturally occupies some place in Mr. HERMAN'S book. But the main interest of the book will be found in the efforts of the German Church to carry out its second, post-war, task of Reconstruction. And one of the first-fruits of this new attitude is the earnest attempt that has been made to achieve a union of the churches. A new body has been constituted under the name 'The Evangelical Church in Germany.' A Council

of Twelve was elected at a great gathering as a provisional Church Government, the primary purposes of which were to provide an interim authority to represent the common interests of the Evangelical Churches in foreign relations, in the Ecumenical Movement, in material relief matters, and especially to prepare the way for a final Church Order by calling a national synod.

In the gatherings at which these projects were ventilated repentance was constantly referred to as an indispensable preliminary to rebirth. Niemöller has made a strong appeal for complete conversion to begin in the Church itself, because the people could not be urged to repent until their spiritual leaders had done so. And the Council of the Protestant Church in Germany, in October at Stuttgart, greeting the representatives of the World Council of Churches, said: 'We have struggled for many years in the name of Jesus Christ against a spirit which found its terrible expression in the National-Socialist regime of violence, but we accuse ourselves for not witnessing more courageously, for not praying more faithfully, for not believing more joyously, and for not loving more ardently.'

This is the answer to those who ask: 'Has the German Church repented?' It is true that there is some hesitation about repenting *alone*. Many German Christians have been totally unaware of the outrages that have shocked the world. And others have suspected the cry of 'war-guilt' and 'collective guilt.' But the great conferences of Church members, led by men like Niemöller, Bishop Wurm, and Dibelius, have acknowledged that the first step on the way back to unity with world-Christianity, is this very confession of war-guilt.

These two things, the earnest, broad-spirited effort after unity of all German evangelical Christians and the open profession of repentance, are signs of a real uprising of spiritual life in Germany. But one of the German Church's greatest problems is that of leadership. Part of the Nazi policy of Church-extermination was to cut off the supply of young and able men who would be the Church's teachers and leaders, and, though the Confessing Church made strenuous efforts to remedy this evil, by establishing seminaries for training evangelical pastors, the success was very partial.

Therefore the most urgent question before the Church to-day concerns the quality of the youth studying theology with a view to ordination. Mr. HERMAN has made a special investigation into this matter and has given his readers a reassuring report. If this matter is as hopeful as appears from his contacts we may look for a real approach of German Christians to unity with the rest of the Christian world and a resurgence of life within the German Evangelical Church.

This note on a remarkable book may fitly end with some words written by Niemöller in his introduction to Mr. HERMAN'S book. 'In the course of the last twenty years Christendom has become increasingly aware of the blessed fact that the Church of Jesus Christ on earth is *one* over all national frontiers and that we neither dare nor can segregate ourselves by nationalities. Even though the Body of Christ may possess both strong and feeble members, each of these members has been called to the service of the entire Body and the Body cannot dispense with a single one of them. The Church in Germany to-day may rightly be regarded as a decidedly feeble member; nevertheless, if the Lord of the Body so wills, her service will be accounted of use to the whole.'

The late Rev. R. O. P. TAYLOR, Vicar of Ringwood, Hants, formerly Provost of Cumbrae, left a MS. on the subject of the Gospels which Dr. L. Hodgson has prepared for publication—*The Groundwork of the Gospels*.[1] It has made an interesting and attractive book, though in parts it can hardly be called up-to-date. The author's intention is to show by an examination of the background of the Gospels that they can be relied on as giving a true record of the deeds and words of Christ. It is in particular the contemporary method of 'teaching by word of mouth and learning by heart' that the author examines, concluding that this method preserved original statements better than do written documents.

Mr. TAYLOR interests himself in the questions, which have been much in the minds of students of the New Testament for more than a generation, whether Jesus usually spoke in Greek and whether the Gospels were originally written in Greek. He inclines strongly to the opinion that Jesus not only spoke Greek and spoke to Greek, or largely Græcized audiences, but that we have the reports of His sayings in the original language.

The chapter, 'Did our Lord Speak Greek?,' is not from Mr. TAYLOR'S pen, though evidently he intended to incorporate it in his book. It is described as by 'the Rev. George Albert Smith of

[1] Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net.

Aberdeen.' The burden of it is that while it is fashionable at present to assume that Jesus spoke Aramaic, and only Aramaic, it is highly probable that Greek was commonly used in Palestine in the first century, and more than probable that Jesus Himself spoke it naturally and frequently, if not habitually.

Let us tabulate the main points of the evidence adduced in the chapter: (1) Jesus spent the first years of His life in Egypt, that is, in a Greek-speaking community; (2) The Septuagint, a Greek version of the Scriptures, was the Bible of the Jewish people in the time of Jesus; (3) In the Gospels instances are reported of Jesus speaking in a language, Aramaic, which the Evangelists considered it necessary to translate into Greek in order that their readers might understand; (4) The language of all the four Evangelists is Greek; (5) Jesus' audiences were not so local and confined that a patois like Aramaic would suffice; (6) Weighty evidence for the prevalence of Greek is provided by Jesus' associates—Peter, James, and John.

The writer of the chapter thus summarized shows himself in various places a very conservative critic—unduly conservative, one is inclined to think. But Mr. TAYLOR appears to endorse his positions. And he follows up with a chapter of his own, 'Did Jesus Speak Aramaic?' Neither writer, it may be here remarked, takes specific cognisance of the contributions of Burney, Torrey, or Goodspeed (to name a few salient names) to this discussion. It is an older contribution, that of James Young in the *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels* on the 'Language of Christ,' that Mr. TAYLOR deals with in the first half of his chapter.

There he contends that (1) the use of the word Aceldama does not prove that Aramaic was the popular language even of the inhabitants of Jerusalem; (2) The 'Hebrew tongue' in which the voice spoke to St. Paul on the Damascus road does not mean Aramaic; (3) The deeper silence into which the mob in Jerusalem settled when St. Paul spoke to them in Aramaic proves no more than that the inhabitants of Jerusalem were bilingual; (4) The evidence of Josephus in his preface to 'The Wars of the Jews' does not prove that it was more natural for him to write in Aramaic than in Greek; (5) Peter, James, and John, who appear to have known Greek, must be regarded as representative of the people generally in this respect.

'The eyes of scholars,' as Mr. TAYLOR goes on to say in the second half of the chapter, 'seem to be blinded by the successful campaigns of the Maccabees against the introduction of the Hellenic idolatry and the Greek circus. But that did not result in the renunciation of international trade and the language in which it was carried on, any more than it meant the refusal of the Jewish Diaspora to speak the language of the cities where they dwelt, or for that matter, the renunciation of the Greek Version of the Bible. It was the religion to which they objected. A comparable case is that of Eire. The majority of its inhabitants have steadfastly rejected the type of religion which is characteristic of England. But English is the universal language of the country.'

As for the results achieved by the scholars who have sought to reconstruct an Aramaic Gospel underlying our Greek Gospels, here is what Mr. TAYLOR has to say: 'The only result of this labour has been to show that the Greek of the Gospels has a Galilean colouring—just as the English of a Welshman or a Scottish Highlander has a colour derived from the native language, and the English of an Irishman still retains the colour of a language which has disappeared.'

One could wish that Mr. TAYLOR had brought his readers closer to the work of the scholars in question, but one sympathises with his repugnance to the thought that if Jesus spoke in Aramaic we cannot have His ideas at first hand. Are we to suppose, he asks, that Jesus either refused to use the only language known to so many of the lost sheep of Israel, or had only learnt the patois of a minority?

Jesus spent most of His life, he adds, at the point where the cross-roads of the world met. (As the late Sir George Adam Smith says, 'Galilee was on the road to everywhere.') There the Greek speech sounded continually in His ears, and from there His voice could go out to the ends of the earth. 'His position in space and in the history of language did not constitute a barrier to, but provided a gateway for, the Divine plan.'

The Technique of Preaching.

By the Reverend T. Tudor Rhys, B.A., B.D., Hinckley.

I. Music and the Minister.

Preaching is a vocation. We are called to the ministry of the Word. But it is also an art, a craft, a trade. Most workmen can buy, or are given their tools, but the preacher has to make his own, namely, his sermons. And now comes the inevitable question: What is the difference between preaching and sermonizing? The answer is equally irresistible: Preaching is having something to say, sermonizing is having to say something. Granted; but a great deal depends upon how that 'something' is said. If you want to know whether your sermon has 'got across' or not, the question to ask is not, has it 'got there,' but will it 'stop there'? Will it live on in your hearers' minds as one organic whole? Will they remember it as a man remembers a picture he has once seen, a song he has once heard, a person he has once met? Not all sermons stand that test. 'What did you think of the preacher this morning?' 'Oh, I enjoyed him very much.' 'Good, what was his sermon about?' 'Do you know, I haven't the faintest idea!' A minister was going home from the morning service with his little girl. 'Darling,' asked father, 'can you tell me what was in my sermon this morning?' 'Oh,' was the reply, 'the usual. Just odds and ends.' A first-year student was anxious to know what was the doctor's opinion of a sermon which he intended to preach on the following Sunday. 'Will my sermon do, sir?' he asked. 'Do what?' was the brusque reply. That is the test. Has the sermon done *that*? Has it hit the target? Has it left its mark?

Our concern is not with the content of the sermon but with its construction, not with the soul but with its body. That is to say, with its *form*. Is there a sermonic form?

Form means coherence. No idea can find utterance without form, but the form will take its shape from the idea. Form and function go together. The technique of preaching is determined by the reason why it is preaching and not writing an essay, making a speech, giving an address, delivering a lecture, and so forth. If we are to find the form of the sermon we must ask, what is its idea? What is the function of the sermon? What makes it a sermon and not anything else? The nearest thing to preaching is teaching, but there is a difference. Teaching begins with what is already in the mind of the taught. It begins with the familiar, the relative, the subjective. Preaching, on the other hand, begins with the positive, the ultimate. Preaching has to do with absolute values. The teacher asks: 'What do you think about God?' But the preacher says: 'This is what God thinks about you.' The lesson leads to a discussion. The sermon leads to a decision. The teacher invites questions. The preacher demands an answer.

The best book ever written on preaching is the New Testament. In his book, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, Professor C. H. Dodd brings out the New Testament distinction between *kerygma* (preaching) and *didache* (teaching). The *didache* had to do with ethical teaching, moral instruction and exhortation. *Kerygma*, on the other hand, was something quite different. It was the public proclamation of the gospel of Christ, and the *Keryx*, or preacher, would have said: 'I am not arguing with you, I am telling you.' Mr. Quentin Reynolds, the American journalist, has said that the four best reporters who ever lived were Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. The fact is that the Evangelists were not mere reporters or even biographers; they were preachers. And so was Jesus. And the apocalyptic pictures and the parables were forms in which the absolute values of the gospel facts were asserted, proclaimed and preached with a view, not to discussion but to a decision. In passing, may I say that, if this is so, then a good deal of our modern preaching is not preaching at all, in the New Testament sense. Add to this the modern tendency of the laity (and of some preachers, too?) to drop the word 'sermon' and to call it 'the address,' and the danger of the sermon being whittled away or squeezed out altogether. There may be reasons for all this; but it will do us preachers no harm to know exactly where we stand.

If we are looking for the form of the sermon, the form must fit the function, and the function of the sermon is not to discuss but to declare. Real preaching is not talking about God, it is speaking for God. A sermon is not an announcement of what the preacher thinks but a declaration of what God has done and is still doing. Therefore, whatever the sermonic form may be, it must never be vague, woolly, hazy, abstract. It must be vivid, dramatic, pictorial, diagrammatic—easily received and long retained.

How are we to account for the strange and strong appeal that music makes to the normal man and woman? The appeal of music to the

human heart is due to the form in which a piece of music is cast. It is the form which every man's life is divinely ordered to take. Musical form is an interpretation of life.

When a musician sits down to compose a song, a sonata, a symphony, he does not just jot down the first series of notes that comes into his head, however pleasing or instructive those notes may be. He has to arrange his notes according to certain rules. Before they become a tune or song, those notes must be fitted into a form. Now when a man looks casually into his life, or when his outlook has been disturbed by anxiety or illness, he is inclined to think of his life as a series of more or less unrelated happenings. His view of life is very much like that of the little girl's impression of her father's sermon, just 'odds and ends.' It is the view of life suggested by John Masefield's novel, *Odtaa*, one —— thing after another! There are times when life doesn't seem to make sense. It is full of sound and fury signifying nothing. Now, it is the function of music to make us see (through hearing) that human life is nothing of the sort. The musician's vocation is to bring order out of chaos, to bring unity out of what seems unrelated and fragmentary. The vocation of the preacher is similar to that of the musician. Each is one—

> who looks
> In steadiness, who hath among least things
> An under-sense of greatest; sees the parts
> As parts, but with a feeling of the whole.

Every preacher's sermon, like every singer's song, should convey to the hearer the good tidings that no man's life is a mere fragment, but that every human soul, though now, maybe, sundered and estranged, is part of one living and organic whole. There is a correspondence between the vocation of the musician and that of the preacher. Is there also a correspondence between their respective techniques? First of all, what is musical form?

Every tune, even the simplest, is made up of two tunes. That is the essential thing to remember. Take any simple, well-known tune like the 'Old Hundredth.' It begins with a little tune, the preacher's text, as it were. Then, in contrast with it, you hear a second little tune which comes to an end with a reminder or reminiscence of tune No. One. The preacher, as it were, comes back to his text enriched by all the treatment which it has undergone. The same principle is observed in a slightly enlarged form in such tunes as 'All Through the Night' and 'The Bluebells of Scotland.' They begin with a little tune, the text or leading theme or first subject. In order that that first little tune may be fixed firmly in the mind it is repeated, just as the preacher repeats his text or main subject so that there shall be no mistake as to what the sermon is all about. Then, in contrast with that first tune, we hear a second tune and, finally, the piece ends with a repetition of the first tune. It is the same tune, note for note, that is repeated, and yet, somehow, it is different. The difference is due to the all-important fact that what has happened since we heard it first has been poured into it and has thereby transformed it and made it a new creation.

A more extended form is the Sonata form, but it is the same principle. It can be heard in the first movement of a classical sonata or symphony. It is divided (like many a sermon!) into three parts, the Exposition, the Development, the Recapitulation. (1) Exposition—It begins with a little tune, the text or leading theme. Like a wise preacher, the composer repeats that first little tune in some way or other. It is firmly stated and emphasized, as the musicians say. We shall not forget it as we go along. The key, too, is firmly stated, the tonic key. No one can go away not knowing what the whole piece has been about. Then, in contrast with the first tune we now hear a second tune and this, in turn, has its say. Gradually, this second tune slides into another, related key, the dominant. In this first part, the Exposition, we have been introduced to two tunes. These two tunes may drift apart and we wonder, such is the art of the composer, what is going to happen. Our sense of expectancy is keyed up, our interest is aroused and we come to the second part. (2) Development—You hear the two tunes again, perhaps separately, but you are made to feel that they belong to one another and were made for one another. They may resist and even defy one another, but you feel that something has got to happen. The whole movement is leading to a crisis. And the crisis comes. The two tunes come together and the key returns to the key of the first tune, the tonic. There is a crisis of reconciliation. (3) Recapitulation—The two tunes are now not two but one. The differences have been resolved. The wanderer has returned. There is a full and glad surrender of the one to the other, a reconciliation of the one with the other. And the whole movement ends in a glad and triumphant coda or finale, a climax of fulfilment.

That, then, is the basic form of every piece of music whether it is strictly observed or not. Is it just the whim or foible of musicians? No, there is a correspondence between musical form and the form of every human life. And because it is the life form it is the sermon form.

It would be interesting to examine some of the 'sermons' and parables of the New Testament from this point of view to see how far they correspond with this form, the sonata or sermon form. There is the Parable of the Prodigal

(younger) Son, for instance. At once you are introduced to the two themes, the tune of the father and the tune of the son. (1) Exposition—The first tune you hear is the son's tune. It is a sad little tune. It wanders off on its own into a far country. And it has its say. Then, in sharp contrast with it, you hear the second tune, the tune of the father. It slips into a different, but related key, the dominant, as you hear it from afar, as the father watches and waits and wonders. (2) Development—You hear the two tunes again. There is a strain and a tension and you feel that they must somehow come to terms with one another. Something is going to happen and the whole movement is working towards a crisis. And the crisis does come. 'And he arose, and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him, and had compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.' (3) Recapitulation—You hear the two tunes again, the son's tune and the father's tune, but there is a difference. They are no longer two tunes, but one. Each has been enriched by what has gone before. The whole movement comes back to the original key, the tonic, the home key. And then comes the grand coda or finale, the climax of fulfilment and reconciliation: 'For this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.'

A similar test may be applied to the great evangelical passages and texts of the Bible and it will be found that they are cast in the life or sonata form. There are always the two tunes or themes, the evil and the good, the temporal and the eternal, the man and his God, the sinner and his Saviour. Each stands confronting the other. Each is clearly stated. Then comes the strain and tension and the wandering away from one another. You have the failure to do without one another and then the coming to terms ending in the great climax of reconciliation. 'For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation.' 'Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.' All such great evangelical words as these fit into the form. They are ready to be rendered, they are all crying out to be preached. A sermon should sing itself through the preacher's mind and heart and so through the hearts and minds of his hearers.

II. The Preacher's Preposition.

'All methods of preaching are right,' said a certain wise man, 'except the wrong one.' To enlarge a little upon that let us change our sphere of discourse and inquire which is the preacher's preposition. Should the preacher preach before his audience or beyond it? Should he preach beneath or with his congregation? Ought he to preach at or to his people?

(1) Should a preacher preach *before* his people? A special preacher had been invited to preach 'before,' let us say, the local Free Church Council. He did, indeed. Every now and then he would look at his paper, and then, with suitable gestures, he would lift his gaze, now to a point in the far left-hand corner of the gallery, now to a point in the top right-hand corner. It was a very good sermon and it was undoubtedly preached 'before' that congregation. But here is a very different story. During the sermon (not the foregoing), the preacher noticed that a small boy, who had been watching him intently, suddenly turned to his mother and whispered excitedly: 'Mother, that man is talking to *me*!' In other words, preaching should be *personal*.

(2) Should a preacher preach *beyond* his people, over their heads? That, surely, would not be of much use! Yet, I wonder what those early Christians must have thought as they listened to some of Paul's letters. Indeed, we are told what they thought. The writer of 2 Peter refers to 'our brother, Paul, who, according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you—epistles—in which are some things hard to be understood.' I once heard Dr. P. T. Forsyth tell this story about his friend and neighbour, W. L. Watkinson. The great preacher had come to tell his friend that a deputation of Church officers had called upon him to register a complaint. 'What was the complaint?' asked Dr. Forsyth. 'Oh,' said Watkinson, 'they complained that I preached over their heads.' 'What did you say to them?' asked the Principal. 'I said to them: "Brethren, lift up your heads!"' Yes, there is that. A sermon should suggest more than it can say, and point beyond where we can reach. Preaching should be *propulsive*.

(3) Should a preacher preach *beneath* his hearers? Should he temper the wind, so to speak, to the shorn lamb? Ought the pulpit to 'cater' for these, those, or any others? Should the preacher only preach (to quote the words of the Hibbert Trust) 'Christianity in its most simple and intelligible form?' I still remember the shock of surprise I had years ago when I was a student on reading the opinion of one of my heroes, William Robertson Nicoll, that the test of a good sermon was whether it was intelligible to a child of *eight*! (I cannot verify the reference.) Can this be justified? There are the parables of Jesus. No expert has yet fathomed their depths or scaled

their heights. The conclusion seems to be that preaching, as far as possible, should be palatable and *pictorial*. Menenius' advice to his friend, Coriolanus, holds good for the preacher, too :

> speak to 'em, I pray you,
> In wholesome manner.

(4) Should a preacher preach *with* his people ? A preacher may make a special point, both in and out of the pulpit, of being very much a man of the people. We should, however, heed the warning of John Oman, that it is very easy for us to be like our people in the wrong way and unlike them in the wrong way. Upon all students and (younger) preachers I would urge this, both by way of parable and precept : When you are preaching, never put your hands in your trousers' pockets—except on purpose ! Should a preacher preach *with* his people ? The answer is that no man can go on preaching to the same people year after year—unless he is also their shepherd. In a word, preaching should be *pastoral*.

(5) Should a preacher ever preach *at* his people ? In every human fellowship, Christian no less, matters are sometimes discussed which one would not care to halloo to the reverberate hills or even whisper over the garden wall. Family affairs are best kept within the family circle. That is an unwritten law in most churches. Once, at least, in history, it was found that that law was not being observed and it was discovered where the leakage lay. So I preached a sermon at the person concerned. And it was a sermon on gossip. As soon as I came down from the pulpit, whom should I see coming straight towards me but the brother at whom I had been so pointedly preaching. ' Now for it,' I thought ; ' to your tents, O Israel ! ' He patted me on the arm and said : ' That was the finest sermon you have ever preached, Mr. Rhys,' and, lowering his voice, he added : ' And I am very glad to see Mrs. Chinwag here to-night, it'll do her a lot of good.' That was the first (and last) time for me to preach *at* any one. And yet, there is this : ' By manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.' Preaching, evidently, should be provocative—but *persuasive*.

(6) Should a preacher preach *to* his people ? Yes, that is it. This is the preacher's preposition par excellence. Preaching is not talking about God, it is speaking for God. And that means preaching *to* men. That is to say, preaching is *prophetic*. Here is an incident without comment.

It was the first time that I had ever preached at the —— Baptist Church. It is a big building with seating accommodation for about a thousand. There was a fine congregation that Sunday morning and I was young and nervous. In mounting the pulpit steps I am afraid I thought a good deal about myself. Was I going to be heard in that vast building ? Was I even going to be seen ? May God forgive me ! I was about to sit down in the pulpit chair when I caught sight of something which gave me a shock from which I have not even yet recovered. Written in gold lettering underneath the Bible rest, and meant to catch the preacher's eye as he faced the people, were these words : ' Sirs, *we* would see *Jesus*.'

There is nothing more that can or that needs to be said.

Literature.

AN ARAMAIC SOURCE.

Those who desire to come to a closer understanding of the Aramaic element in the Gospel tradition cannot do better than entrust themselves to the scholarly guidance of Dr. Matthew Black in his recently published investigation of this absorbing but perplexing problem. Dr. Black modestly entitles his book, for which he has been awarded the D.Litt. of the University of Glasgow, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford University Press ; 15s. net).

In Part I he gives an illuminating account of earlier work in this field and discusses the linguistic and textual approach to the problem. The great contributions of Dalman, Wellhausen, Nestle, Torrey, Burney, and, more recently, those of the late A. J. Wensinck of Leyden, are judiciously studied and assessed. Dr. Black is inclined to think that earlier investigators have depended too exclusively on the WH text, or that of Tischendorf, and have attached too much importance to alleged mistranslations of Aramaic as a proof of source. By no means inclined to deny the relevance of alleged mistranslation, he urges that the examples must be credible and the conjectured Aramaic possible. Dr. Black welcomes, for example, Wellhausen's well-known suggestion that ' cleanse ' in Mt 23^{26} and ' give alms ' in Lk 11^{41} go back to *dakkau* and *zakkau* respectively, and he approves Torrey's submission that ' cities ' in the Lukan Parable of the Pounds is a misrendering of the Aramaic word for ' talents ' ; but he rejects, as incredible or linguistically unsound, some of

Torrey's best-known suggestions, notably in respect of Mk 7^{3} 14^{3} and Ac 2^{47}.

As against Dalman, Dr. Black finds the best representative of first century Palestinian Aramaic, not in the Targums of Onkelos and of Jonathan, but in the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum, the Samaritan Aramaic, and the Christian Palestinian Syriac. Especially important is his claim that many of the alleged 'Syriacisms' in D may be Aramaisms derived from the Aramaic sources and background of the Gospels.

The detailed investigations on which these and other opinions are based are set forth in Parts II. and III., which treat questions of syntax, grammar, and vocabulary, and the Semitic poetic form. Part IV. deals with the vexed problem of the translation of Aramaic, and here many difficult passages are treated with great learning and exegetical insight. In particular, Mk 4^{12} may be mentioned, which Dr. Black thinks is not a simple translation of Aramaic, although the Evangelist depends on Aramaic sources (witness his use of the Targum on Is $6^{9f.}$), but Mark's personal interpretation of the original saying. Of absorbing interest is Dr. Black's conclusion, that, while the Gospels are not direct translations of Aramaic originals, the Evangelists have used an Aramaic sayings-source or tradition, especially in recording the words of Jesus. In agreement with G. R. Driver, he comes to a similar conclusion in respect of the Fourth Gospel.

This scholarly work gives to Dr. Black a prominent place among that small band of research students to which we are all indebted for guidance amid the thorny problems of the Gospels and the Acts, and so for a better understanding of the teaching of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

THE WAY OF LIFE.

Good books on Christian ethics are not plentiful. But here is one—*The Way of Life*, by the Rev. C. J. Barker, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net). The author is the Vicar of Great Torrington, and he has put a good deal of hard thought into the making of his book. The pity is that it costs so much, for ministers would find material for many sound Christian sermons in it.

The book comprises twenty-one chapters. It begins with Repentance, the gateway of the moral life, and it ends with a chapter on the Kingdom of God. Between these two chapters will be found fresh and stimulating discussions of practically every problem in Christian ethics. Truth, Fear, Love, Punishment, Social Relations, and the Christian Doctrine of Work, Sin, and Forgiveness are all given full and vivid treatment.

It is hardly necessary to say that Mr. Barker is thoroughly Christian in his thinking. He has realized (what is indeed a commonplace but is so often forgotten) that sound Christian ethics are the flowering of a fresh and vigorous Christian life, and that you cannot divorce ethics from religion. The very title of his book is suggestive, and in his Introduction Mr. Barker sets forth his approach to his subject as follows. The Christian life, he says, is (1) a *way*—a pilgrim way, with a starting-place and a goal. (2) It is a way of *life* with all that life implies of vigour, creativeness, and freedom. (3) It is *a way of life* that has been learned from a life that has been lived. These three sentences summarize the originality of Mr. Barker's approach. The first point to seize, he says, is that Christian ethics are essentially eschatological. In this he is absolutely right. Every student of the New Testament knows, or ought to know, that the major premiss of all Christ's ethical teaching is the assertion: 'The Kingdom of God has come.' Mr. Barker's second main point is that all true Christian ethics are Incarnational: that is, they take their inspiration and pattern from the perfect life of God made manifest in Christ.

With these two guiding principles Mr. Barker ranges over the whole field of morals. It is not a systematic treatment—perhaps that is the capital weakness of the book—but there is hardly a page that does not yield some moral insight or some telling illustration. For Mr. Barker is obviously a good classic, and he can quote freely from Plato or Thucydides, Cicero, or Lucretius. Not that he knows only the ancient philosophers. Hartmann and von Hügel, Berdyaev and Clement Webb have obviously been read with a discerning mind. Finally, he knows his poets, especially Browning and Masefield, and there is hardly a chapter where we do not find them felicitously pressed into the service of his argument. But, and this is the supreme merit of the book, Mr. Barker knows his New Testament, knows too that there is still an astonishing relevance in the parables of our Lord or in the ethics of St. Paul for our modern perplexities.

My only complaint is a certain discinct-ness in the style. I do not always see the logical nexus between sentence and sentence. I feel, too, that Mr. Barker does not always make his points clear, or show us the thread of his argument. But these are inconsiderable criticisms in what is a fine and true book. Mr. Barker has the right approach to his problem and a genuinely Christian mind. If the price is not too high, this is a book to buy.

A. M. HUNTER.

THE EXPANSION OF ANGLICANISM.

Canon J. McLeod Campbell has just published a book, *Christian History in the Making* (Press and Publications Board of the Church Assembly; 15s. 6d. net), of which the Archbishop of York says in his introduction that 'it may easily prove to be the most important which has yet been written on the missionary work of the Church of England.' Canon McLeod Campbell, whose name links him with the Church of Scotland in a relationship of which that Church can be at once proud and deeply regretful, writes with the authority of one who gave the early years of his service to Trinity College, Kandy, of which he was Principal, and his later years to the task of unifying the Missions of his Church through the Missionary

Council of the Church Assembly of which he has been General Secretary for the last ten years.

Three-fourths of his book is history—the history of how Christianity first took root in the soil of England, and then, suddenly, in its Anglican form, under the influence of some new accession of life and vigour, began to reach forth to the ends of the earth. Having looked back, he then, in the remainder of his book, looks forward and considers the claims and needs of the future.

It is not an easy matter to cover so wide an area of the world's surface and travel down so many centuries, and at the same time to maintain the interest of the narrative. Canon McLeod Campbell succeeds in doing so by his selection of his material and by the vivid glimpses he gives of typical individuals. His quotations are admirably illustrative of his theme. He shows us Erasmus as an enthusiast for missions (perhaps because of his historical imagination) in contrast with Luther and Calvin and Zwingli. His sketches of Christian Frederick Schwartz and Bishop Selwyn and Bishop French and of many others are admirably done. He reminds us how much Anglican missions owe to Germany, to men like Ziegenbalg and Krapf and Pfander and that extraordinary Jew, Joseph Wolff, whom Goethe encouraged to 'follow the bent of his mind' and become a Christian.

The book is full of memorable portraits of men of action and of examples of their vigorous speech. They were not always perfectly wise. Heber and Schwartz are said to have wanted to tolerate caste in the Church in South India, but fortunately that error was corrected.

One omission that strikes us in Canon McLeod Campbell's survey is the absence of any woman's name among the many missionaries to whom he refers and his failure to mention work for women. No doubt that is due to lack of space in what is necessarily a rapid outline.

Something must be said of the important section with which the book ends, which deals with such subjects as 'Acclimatization' and 'Consolidation.' He gives this as one question that must be answered: 'Has the Church succeeded in transplanting the essentials to the exclusion of the non-essential, the true Vine to the exclusion of degenerate forms and parasitic growths?' Every church that is a missionary church has to ask and answer such a question as that, and has to do so especially at the present time in missionary history. In some respects the Anglican Church—with its alleged 'comprehensiveness'—has special need to make sure of its policy in this matter.

The Church of England has no Pope or College of Cardinals to guide it and is agreed apparently in rejecting a 'Canterbury Patriarchate.' What does 'the ancient precedence of the See of Canterbury' imply? The Thirty-Nine Articles, which C. F. Andrews saw to be unsuited to be a formulary of an Indian Church, is now omitted from the constitution of both the Church of Japan and the Church of India, Burma, and Ceylon. Is it sufficient to have the Book of Common Prayer—next to the Bible—as the authoritative standard of its doctrine? These are questions with which this book deals and which would need, it is evident, to be clearly and definitely answered.

Canon McLeod Campbell sets the urgent problems here involved before his Church and presses for their consideration. He takes Bishop Trollope of Korea and Bishop Tucker of Uganda as representative of two Anglican types and adds, 'no one would claim that either combined in his person the whole ethos of the Anglican heritage.' 'It is the African, Indian, or Chinese Church which pays the price of our segregation into the parties which are complacently assumed to be of the nature of things.' These facts point to serious difficulties that have to be surmounted if Anglicanism is to be a World Church. Some of the difficulties that face its future are illustrated in the problem of South Indian Union. Canon McLeod Campbell sees clearly the need for consolidation and for some new policy which, the Archbishop of York suggests, would exchange 'the present organization for overseas work' for one 'giving the Church as a whole greater responsibility.'

NICOL MACNICOL.

EMPIRICAL THEOLOGY.

The Common Sense Theology of Bishop White (King's Crown Press; London: Oxford University Press; 14s. net) contains 'Selected Essays from the Writings of William White, 1748–1836, First Bishop of Pennsylvania and a Patriarch of The American Church, with an Introductory Survey of his Theological Position by Sydney A. Temple, Jr., Ph.D.'

Perhaps one should observe at the outset that King's Crown Press is a division of Columbia University Press organized for the purpose of making certain scholarly material available at minimum cost. The works are presented substantially as submitted by the authors, without the usual editorial attention of Columbia University Press. It does not look, however, as though the present work has suffered much in consequence, though there are misprints that would certainly not have escaped editorial vigilance.

Dr. Temple is to be congratulated not only on his choice of subject (chosen, we suppose, as suitable for an academic thesis) but also on his treatment of it. It may be that he assigns too much importance to Bishop White as a systematic theologian; we fail to find anything greatly original in the Bishop's standpoint. But the elucidation of his theological opinions was a task well worth while, and Dr. Temple has achieved it with laudable ability and diligence.

Bishop White's views on Christian Doctrine are to be gleaned from his 'Comparative Views of the Calvinistic and Arminian Controversy,' which is a work that would not for itself excite much interest to-day. Unfortunately the work that would best have enabled us to estimate him as a systematic theologian is lost: his 'Four Lectures on the Threefold State of Man.' It is in seeking to reconstruct the positions of the 'Four Lectures' from the 'Comparative Views' and other works

that Dr. Temple's Introductory Survey has its chief merit.

The survey is offered under the four heads of Revelation and Evidence, Theory of the Church, On the State of Man, Sacramental Efficacy. The impression left upon us is that here was a man of strong intellectual quality, of a clear and logical mind, suspicious of aught that savoured of the mystical or the magical, who sought to be faithful to the Protestant tradition of the Anglican Church. Of him and his school an historian of the American Episcopal Church has remarked that 'they were disposed to emphasize, perhaps too much, the rational and intellectual side of Christianity, but they never yielded its supernatural claims altogether in favour of mere rationalism. If they were, as a rule, somewhat lacking in fire, they were strong in judiciousness and moderation.'

We should have liked Dr. Temple to bring out more clearly and with greater precision what he means in describing Bishop White's theology as 'empirical' and 'common sense,' and in distinguishing it from Deism, Calvinism, and Quakerism. No doubt it was influenced on the philosophical side by John Locke and on the religious side by the Reformation Movement in England, but those influences are not so carefully assessed as one could desire. It would be interesting to learn whether there was any direct Zwinglian influence upon the Bishop's doctrine concerning the Lord's Supper; his insistence upon its memorial aspect is very emphatic.

Bishop White's style is at its best lucid and coherent, if usually plain, unadorned, and even *steif*. A good sample of it occurs in the first of the Selected Essays, which is an address on 'The Source of Knowledge' to candidates for ordination. He would make the point that 'the attainments of theological literature are essential to respectability in the ministry,' and this is how he goes on: 'You will, however, be aware that what you possess is only a foundation for the acquirement of future industry; and this needs not to interfere with active duties, if they have been begun with a sufficiency of information. For, in having the various subjects arranged in the mind by a systematic course of study, there is the advantage, that every subsequent attainment takes its proper station, among what are already in possession: while disregard of this obvious order, in being slenderly furnished in the beginning, even if the deficiency should be supplied by further reading, sometimes causes that a mass of learning lies an undigested heap; the possessor of it entertaining opinions not in harmony, although the fault may escape his notice.'

W. FULTON.

An article on *The Beginning of the Jewish Day* has been reprinted from 'The Jewish Quarterly Review' by the author, Professor P. J. Heawood. On the basis of both Biblical and Rabbinic usage he argues for the view that the day began at dawn and not at sunset, and gives a thorough study of an interesting subject.

The Holy Spirit in the Life of Today (Canterbury Press; 6s. net), by the Rev. F. W. Dillistone, M.A., D.D., is the fourth volume of the new 'St. Paul's Library' series. In this series an effort is made from within the Church of England to interpret evangelical theology to our times. The interpretations here offered seek to avoid the extremes of Liberalism on the one hand and Traditionalism (in the forms of neo-Mediaevalism and neo-Calvinism) on the other. The volumes of the series are of modest length, and are meant to be readable alike 'to the intelligent amateur and to the trained student.' The volume now under review admirably fulfils this intention. In it the nature of spirit is discussed, and a survey made of the Biblical account of the revelation of Holy Spirit; then the activity of the Spirit is described in terms of Life, Power, Order, and Glory. Finally, it is asked: Is there a way whereby man can receive the Holy Spirit and enjoy His abiding presence in his own heart? The matter is attractively presented, and the author has made good use of recent contributions to the subject, chiefly those of a popular character.

We have received for review two volumes of the new series of 'Mirfield Books,' which is designed to give clear and orthodox teaching about fundamentals of Catholic Faith and Morals. It is put forth with the same intention and in the same spirit as the 'Tracts for the Times,' with which the early history of the Oxford Movement is closely bound up. Though they are called 'Mirfield Books,' they are not all of them written by members of the Community of the Resurrection.

At the head of the series comes *And Then the Judgement* (Dacre Press; 4s. net), by the Rev. Frank Biggart, C.R., who tries to say as plainly as possible what a Christian believes about life after death. In doing so he discusses in succession the nature of man, the meaning of heaven, the meaning of hell, and the meaning of purgatory. Some readers will not be satisfied that the author has come to real grips with the difficulties of the subject, but they will allow that his treatment is clear and interesting, and that he has been at pains to be persuasive. There is much useful quotation in the volume, from writers old and new.

The second volume of the series is entitled *Pagans—Black and White* (4s. net), by Reginald Smith, C.R., who tells us that he is a working missionary in South Africa. In this book he discusses the missionary vocation, its nature, the Church's fulfilment of it, the Church's present attitude to it; the Christian duty of intercession for missions; the necessity of missionary work; the care of men's bodies; the care of men's minds (education); the Church and colour. In speaking of this last subject he says very sorrowfully that it is not only the railway carriages that are for 'Europeans Only' but the Anglican churches; and he points to the better example of

the Roman Catholic churches. A useful and informative book, as sincere as it is simple.

It would seem that Jews as well as Christians are feeling the demand for some popular form of the Bible. Attempts to meet this need have been made in this country, notably by the late C. G. Montefiore and J. H. Hertz. Now we have one from America—*Pathways through the Bible*, by Mortimer J. Cohen (Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia; $3.00). The book contains extensive selections from the accepted Jewish translations, with occasional modifications and a few transpositions. The various sections are provided with simple explanatory introductions, and the volume is enriched with coloured plates by the Jewish artist, Arthur Szyk. Jewry is to be congratulated on the appearance of this book.

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch (The Newman Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland; $2.50), translated by Professor James A. Kleist, S.J., Ph.D., is the first volume of the series, 'Ancient Christian Writers,' which is intended to be a monumental collection of the works of the Fathers translated and edited under Catholic auspices. It is said that it is more than time such a new collection of translations should be made. The translations are intended to be at once faithful to the original message and intelligible to the twentieth-century reader. Certainly the Editors have been fortunate in securing the services of Father Kleist as translator and annotator of the opening volume of the series. Not only is he well versed in Hellenistic and Patristic Greek, he is also a practised writer on Biblical and allied topics. This volume clearly reflects his scholarship and his experience in authorship; and it may be heartily commended to Catholic and Protestant readers alike. Father Kleist is well acquainted with the works of both English and Continental writers dealing with those early Epistles, and acknowledges in particular his debt to J. B. Lightfoot.

A very interesting memoir, *Henry Wheeler Robinson*, late Principal of Regent's Park College, Oxford (Nisbet; 12s. 6d. net), has been written by the Rev. E. A. Payne. In just over a hundred pages of biography we are shown, first, an unusual childhood, then strenuous student-days in London, Edinburgh, and Oxford. This is followed by an account of his pastoral work in Pitlochry and in Coventry. Thereafter comes his teaching work in Leeds, London, and Oxford. The memoir leaves us in no doubt that Wheeler Robinson was a great man and a great scholar.

The second (and larger) part of the book helps us to see something of Wheeler Robinson's amazing versatility. It consists of six hitherto unpublished lectures. In their variety and freshness we see something of the secret of his success as a teacher.

The volume is illustrated with two photographs. One is from the painted portrait of Robinson. It tends to represent him as a shade more severe-looking and a trifle older than an old pupil remembers. The other is of Regent's Park College, Oxford, itself a lasting monument to a very great man and the realization in stone and lime of his long-cherished dream.

We have as yet in English no commentary of the first rank on II Isaiah; it is one of the few volumes still missing from the *I.C.C.* This may not be altogether a disadvantage. No other book in the Bible demands so full a knowledge of contemporary Mesopotamian history, and here we are constantly gaining fresh insight and ascertaining new facts. Any commentary, for example, would have been badly out of date if it had been written before the publication of Dr. Sidney Smith's Schweich Lectures, delivered in 1941 and published in 1944, under the title *Isaiah: Chapters xl.–lv.* (Oxford University Press; 10s. 6d. net). The first of the three Lectures is devoted to a survey of recent higher criticism. Here a wide field is covered, but it was hardly necessary to take so seriously the proposals of Professor Torrey and the *Gattungforschung* school. It is in the second Lecture that we find the most important contribution to our study of II Isaiah. It gives us in some detail a history, so far as is known, of the fall of Babylon and the rise of Persia. Much of this will be new to the average reader; all is profoundly important. Probably no one else could have presented us with so clear, so full, or so authoritative a statement of the facts. The last lecture is given to an application of the historical background to exegesis, especially in places where references to events have hitherto been overlooked by other scholars. Here the reader may feel more free to exercise his own critical faculty though the case is presented with force and attractiveness. It is interesting to note, among other points, that the Servant of Is 42 (though not of the later 'Songs') is identified with Cyrus, an interpretation which has much to be said for it as Dr. Smith expounds it. But whether we agree with every detail or not, we are compelled to acknowledge that this book is now indispensable to all future understanding and exegesis of one of the greatest among the Prophets.

We have received a copy of the *Nederlandsch Theologisch Tijdschrift* for October 1946. This is the first number of a new 'Dutch Theological Journal' produced by the theological faculties at Leiden, Groningen, Utrecht, and Amsterdam. It is published by H. Veenman & Sons, Wageningen. This number contains articles by Professors Vriezen, De Zwaan, and Van Oyen. At the end there are excellent bibliographies of theological books published in various countries during and since the War. All is in Dutch except Professor De Zwaan's able paper on 'Another Approach to the Idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament.' It is good to know that the various Continental theological journals are waking again from their Rip Van Winkle's sleep, and we wish this new Dutch venture every success.

The Prophets and Sacrifice and Salvation.

By the Reverend Professor Norman H. Snaith, M.A., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

These latter years have seen a strong revival of attempts to minimize the antagonism of the Prophets to sacrifice. Previously the tendency amongst Old Testament scholars was all the other way. It was commonly held that they were definitely antagonistic to it, and that they utterly condemned it.

That the Prophets did condemn sacrifice in no uncertain terms is clear. It is difficult to see how any sound exegesis can avoid this conclusion as the plain meaning of Am 5^{25} and Jer 7^{22}. There are other passages where the antagonism is equally pronounced, Am $4^{4f.}$, Hos 6^{6}, Mic 6^{6-8}, Is 1^{13}. There is also support in the Psalter, notably Ps 40^{6} 50^{8-13} 51^{16}, though there are other Psalms which are equally unmistakably in the opposite camp, including verses even in Ps 50 and 51. But the Prophets have no word in favour.

Perhaps the reason for the modern attempts to show that the Prophets were not antagonistic to sacrifice is a renewed interest in liturgies and rituals. Possibly the reason is to be found in a revolt from easy-going and inadequate theories of the Atonement. The swing-over is unmistakable, whatever the reason for it. The suggestion has even been made that if the Prophets had known the post-exilic cultus, they might have supported it with enthusiasm. Perhaps so, but there were no prophets in those days. They were all growing into apocalyptists, looking forward to a time when everything would be abolished and transformed, both in the heavens above and on the earth beneath.

There is nothing at all strange in the fact that the Prophets condemned sacrifice. They condemned everything. Why should we be careful to exclude this one thing from the general condemnation? They condemned every thing because they found that men will persist in trusting in every thing for their salvation. The prophets knew that salvation comes only from trust in God. It is by Faith alone in Him alone.

Some writers have held that the Prophets were in favour of sacrifice, but were forthright against what they saw and knew in their day. Such writers refer to heathen associations and to the corruption of Canaanite custom. Doubtless there is validity in this contention, for there is nothing so conservative as ritual. The old reasons certainly persist amongst the common people, to whatever extent the religious intelligentsia have provided new and better reasons for the ancient rite. Or again, the alliance of the prophetic guilds of the ninth century with the Rechabites in the revolution which established Jehu has been taken to indicate that the root of the objection to sacrifice was a relic of the old desert days. Again, there is validity in this, for, whatever there was of sacrifice in the old desert days, there was certainly nothing approaching the Canaanite agricultural rituals. Support for this contention is to be found in the fact that Elijah came from Tishbeh in Gilead or, again, that Amos was from Tekoa by the Wilderness of Judah. But there is nothing to connect Isaiah with the desert. If ever a man was city born and bred, that man was Isaiah. And Jeremiah was no desert man, though he was indeed descended from the ancient priesthood of the Ark of Shiloh. Perhaps both Isaiah and Jeremiah were following the old desert tradition without themselves being men of the desert.

Isaiah's complaint was of the multitude of sacrifices and of the way in which they trampled the Temple courts. He was concerned that the people thought that their sacrifices were in themselves of avail with God. They trusted in their sacrifices, that through them God would be pleased to save them. Amos (Am $4^{3f.}$) ironically urges the people to keep up their sacrifices strictly according to rule. His charge is that the people regard them as a means of salvation. It is extremely likely that the Prophets were minded to be as faithful as anyone else in ritual sacrifices, but they did know that *chesed* came first, and *chesed* (usually translated 'mercy,' 'loving-kindness') involved a humble and dutiful obedience to the God of the Covenant. The man 'who shall ascend into the hill of the Lord' is 'he that hath clean hands, and a pure heart . . .' (Ps $24^{3f.}$). Let such a man sacrifice by all means, but let him beware lest he trust in it for his salvation.

The Old Testament Prophets were raised up by the Saviour God, and they were prophets of salvation. This was their theme, and the more faithfully they kept to it, the more certainly they were recognized as prophets. In fact if a prophet had too little salvation in his message, later editors put it in to make sure that it was there. The death of prophecy came when the Deuteronomic idea of the Single Sanctuary became tied to the post-exilic sacrificial system. It took the life and vigour out of the prophetic salvation, for the growing ritual and the detailed fulfilment of all the 'separation' laws provided a system of deeds

on which Israel could pride herself as having accomplished, and as having thus fulfilled what was commanded. Jeremiah saw what was coming, but too late. When the doctrine of salvation broke out again in after times, it was in earth-shaking apocalypses, when all created things in heaven and earth alike vanished before the invasion of a God who would not be denied. The apocalypses belong to times of disaster and despair. It was utter and complete despair so far as all things earthly were concerned. Therefore the salvation had to come from above. The Prophets also belonged to times of disaster, for even though Amos and Hosea were active in a time of unprecedented prosperity, it was only because they were all the more sure of imminent disaster. Only out of disaster can salvation be born, for men have to be stripped bare of everything in which they can possibly trust if there is ever to be any doctrine of salvation. The idea of a Saviour reaches its full content only when there is no thing and nobody else that can possibly save. This is plain from Is 40–55.

The Old Testament is the story of the saving work of the Saviour God. It could be the Book of no people other than one which has rarely known anything but defeat. Other nations, it is true, have been defeated as they were defeated. Their contemporaries have been smashed and shattered one after the other, and they died. Most of this nation died, too, but there was always a Remnant that refused to die. Their conquerors grew rich and powerful in the earth, and they too died in their time, for wealth is equally potent for death as poverty, the one by decay and the other by despair. A large part of this people also has died of prosperity, enticed by the manners and customs of the Gentiles, led away and lost in the general confusion of the peoples. But again there has always been a Remnant. Prosperity has never weakened them, because they always knew that they were never chosen as a people because of their prosperity. Persecution has but increased their vigour, because they knew that in God and in God alone was their only strength and life. This Remnant knew that only by trusting in no thing else and in no one else than the God who brought them up out of the land of Egypt could they ever know the salvation of their earnest prayer.

The New Testament, too, is the story of the yet greater saving work of the Saviour God. It, too, is the Book, in the first instance, of a persecuted minority. In fact it was not until the time of persecutions that there was any New Testament. The writing of the very books themselves was largely during and because of persecution, Paul at the hands of the Jews, and Christians generally at the hands of the Emperor. The New Testament, indeed, is altogether the gospel of the poor and the unprivileged, the slaves and the outcasts. 'Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble . . .,' for after all, 'they that are whole have no need of the physician, but they that are sick.' If there is any book of the New Testament written by a man who felt himself safe, it is the General Epistle of James. Perhaps it was because he did manage to 'keep himself unspotted from the world,' and was unconscious of the rough and tumble of it, like the writers of the Old Testament *Proverbs*, with parts of which the Epistle has no little in common. The New Testament could never have been written after the time of Constantine when Christianity had become the religion of the Empire. It is very hard to combine an effective doctrine of salvation and an alliance with the dominant powers in the State, and the New Testament is essentially a book of Salvation.

The message of the Prophets and that of the New Testament both alike are founded on a full reliance on God alone.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Man with the Donkey.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.A., B.D., Birregurra, Victoria, Australia.

'They brought the colt to Jesus, . . . and he sat upon him.'—Mk 11[7].

This is Palm Sunday—the day on which we celebrate our Lord's entry into Jerusalem. That was a great day for the children of Jerusalem. They swarmed over the streets waving palms and shouting 'Hosannah to the Son of David.' Never would they forget 'The Man with the Donkey.'

Now there's a phrase every little Australian knows—'The Man with the Donkey.' And you should all know his story. If you have not yet seen his statue in Melbourne, do so the next time you go to town. There in the Domain you will see the donkey modelled in bronze carrying a patient sufferer and being led by a 'very gallant gentleman.' John Simpson was a stretcher-bearer in the Australian Field Ambulance on Gallipoli in the First World War. His work was

to bring in wounded men from the battlefield that they might have the attention of doctors and nurses. Stretcher-bearers work in twos, but one day Private John Simpson had a happy thought which led to his working alone. In one of the gullies of Gallipoli he found a donkey. Who owned it he did not know. No one knew. It had probably wandered away from home and lost itself. 'The very thing,' thought Simpson when he saw it. So he caught it and made it his helper in a wonderful work of mercy and devotion. Day after day and often into the night for three weeks Simpson led his donkey into the gullies of Gallipoli in search of wounded men. He would put them on the donkey's back. Then slowly and gently he would bring them to the doctors at the casualty station. This went on till one morning when out of 'the valley of the shadow of death' there came the donkey carrying its wounded soldier but without its leader. Somewhere up the gully John Simpson had fallen to a sniper's rifle.

Now, there's something in that story which makes us thrill. It's the courage and devotion of a good man and a humble beast.

What happened to Simpson's donkey? We don't know. It had no owner, so probably ran wild after the troops left Gallipoli. What happened to Jesus' donkey? It was sent back to its owner. And I have often wondered what that good man thought and felt when his humble beast came home. How he would look on Neddy with pride and say: 'Jesus the King rode on *him*.' Yes, and Jesus the King rode on Simpson's donkey. As the Lord Jesus looked down from heaven on the 'Man with the Donkey' He accepted the work of John Simpson as done for Him. He accepted it because whatever we do to help others we do for Him. He Himself has said so. 'Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.'

Now, you and I have no donkey. We may never have one. Still there are many things we can do 'for His sake.' We can do them every day. And we don't have to go to Gallipoli or to Jerusalem or anywhere far away to do them. We can do them wherever we happen to be. Do you remember singing on Epiphany?—

We'll bring the little duties
We have to do each day;
We'll try our best to please Him
At home, at school, at play.
And better are these treasures
To offer to our King,
Than richest gifts without them,
Yet these a child may bring.

Pinocchio and Jimini.

By the Reverend A. Beaghen, Malmesbury, Wilts.

'Fight the good fight [of faith] . . . keeping hold of faith and a good conscience.'—1 Ti 1[19] (Moffatt).

Have you a conscience? What's its name? Name? It hasn't got one! Then you haven't seen Pinocchio and you are quite behind the times! 'Always let your conscience be your guide' and 'Give a little whistle.' You will remember those two little songs if you saw the film Walt Disney has given us to enjoy when we go to the pictures. Pinocchio has a cat and a conscience, and they both have names. The puss-cat was Figaro and the conscience was Jimini. Figaro was a clever purring chap, Jimini was a funny little jumpy chap—a cricket in fact—and he was told to look after Pinocchio and never leave him. His old father Geppetto gave Pinocchio some sound advice about his conscience. 'Always let your conscience be your guide' and when temptation comes 'Give a little whistle' just to remind him and keep him from doing wrong things. All the adventures Pinocchio had with his cat and his conscience—his sad lapses and the trouble he had to keep hold of his conscience which seemed to him to be ready to leave him at the least encouragement, when really poor Jimini felt he wasn't wanted, are all part of the lovely film Walt Disney has given us in fascinating colour to show how a boy can become a real boy instead of a mere toy. And who would want to be a toy if he could be a boy? Geppetto was a toy-maker whose toys were so lifelike that one day when he had made a jolly little boy he had a sudden longing. 'If only he were a real boy'! The Fairy comes along and, lo! the old man has his wish, but Pinocchio is not quite a boy. He is part toy, part boy, and he has to grow into a real boy with the help of his conscience and his own efforts. 'Let your conscience be your guide' and 'Keep clear of temptation.' Not so easy for Pinocchio or for us but very sound rules to live

Oh that conscience! How it went a-wandering, or was it Pinocchio who wandered? Poor Jimini had a time of it trying to keep up with that elusive half-boy. First Pinocchio gets tied up with a showman who makes lots of money out of him when he discovers that he can dance. The gold rolls up and the greedy, ugly showman doesn't give Pinocchio a penny or a decent meal but shuts him in a bird cage. Pinocchio discovers that his conscience seems to have fled and he doesn't seem able to whistle. He cries for his dear old father and once more the Fairy appears and releases him and he gets away. But he gets caught again by temptation as he journeys homewards and this time it's a gentleman who wants to give boys a whale of a time on Pleasure Island. Honest John doesn't seem the right name for him somehow, but it helped him to beguile the boys, Pinocchio included, into a trip to Pleasure Island, where they could do just what they liked. And there was ice cream galore, roundabouts, cigars to smoke, windows to break. And 'There's no one to stop yer,' cries Honest John to the delight of all the wicked boys who go there. Pinocchio arrived with his Jimini who spoke up when Pinocchio had smoked a cigar and felt very sick. 'How d'yer expect to be a boy?' he said. 'That's my conscience,' Pinocchio said, but he forgot it at once until he found things were getting too unhappy and decided to run away from the island.

'Oh no!' cries Honest John, or was it Jimini? 'You've buttered your bread and you sleep on it.' Honest John was quite honest for once. 'Yer've had yer fun now yer've got to pay for it.' And what a price! The boys began to grow long ears like donkeys; and a tail. They made donkey noises too. Pinocchio had grown two long ears but nothing worse. 'Oh, Jimini!' cried Pinocchio, 'come away quick.' 'Yes,' cried Jimini, 'before you grow a tail and a face like a donkey.' They got away and made for home crying, 'Father, Father! where are you?' But gentle old Geppetto could not be found anywhere. 'It's me, Pinocchio,' he cried. But there was only silence until a note dropped from a pigeon's beak telling them what had happened to Geppetto and Figaro. 'It's about your father, he's not gone far. He went to look for you and he's got swallowed by Monstro the Whale. He's at the bottom of the sea.' Down they drop to the bottom of the sea shouting 'Father, Father!' 'Where's Monstro the whale?' they inquired of an oyster who shut his mouth like a clam. On they went and got inside the whale after a tussle with all sorts of things, and there was old Geppetto and Figaro fishing. What a meeting! 'But those ears, Pinocchio!' cried Geppetto, 'how *did* you get them?' How indeed? Listen, will you, all boys and girls! If we were in danger of growing donkey's ears when we did the things we shouldn't and didn't do the things we should, don't you think we should watch our step a little more carefully? Yes? Then let's go on. Getting out of Monstro was a tough business, and for once Pinocchio forgot *himself* in the fight to get his dear old father and Figaro out, and strange things happened as they do when we forget our own selfish pleasures and wishes and really think about others. Those long ears vanished and he became a real boy, all boy and no toy! 'You're a real boy,' cried Geppetto, almost overcome with joy.

That is the big thing Walt Disney wants to teach us, I think, don't you? And he is saying in his fairy way just what our Great Teacher Jesus has told us is true. He who loves himself alone gets lost, but he who loves others and forgets himself finds greatness and gladness as well. And not only that. Life's a fight and we've got a conscience to help us to see the right and the wrong and to help us to 'sense' temptation when it comes, and to say 'No' as Jesus did. Whistle if you like but don't forget 'Give a little prayer for help' too. If you have to pay for your fun as heavily as Pinocchio had to, it must be the wrong sort of fun. God wants us to have lots of fun, but only the sort of fun that brings no regrets afterwards and that helps others to be happy too. That's the true sort. And who wants to be a real boy? Who wants us to be real boys and girls is a better way to put it? Jesus our best Friend does! And we get nearer and nearer to the real thing as we get nearer to Him and try all we can to be like Him. Oh yes, it's hard, but it is doing the hard things that makes us strong, strong to fight and strong to help.

Better to watch than whistle,
Better to fight than fail.
Better to know that God's story is true
And not just a fairy tale.

Better to think of others first,
Than to think of yourself alone:
For this is the way of the Best Friend of all,
And by that shall His Kingdom be won.

The Christian Year.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Revelling in Trials.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUMBARTONSHIRE.

'Greet it as pure joy, my brothers, when you come across any sort of trial.'—Ja 1[2] (Moffatt).

Is this the sort of counsel of perfection which the average man feels should not be taken too seriously? It is decidedly difficult at least to receive it with any great enthusiasm. For which of us greets either a trial or a temptation with a cheer? How can joy ever enter into the sorely tried heart? Dr. F. W. Faber, that wise director of souls, sets down the reactions of the majority of persons to their encounter with trials when he writes: 'At this very hour thousands of souls are earnestly complaining to God of their temptations, and hundreds of confessionals are filled with whispered and impatient murmurings against the vehemence or the perseverance of them.' Yet, as he adds, St. James says, 'My brethren, count it all joy when you shall fall into divers temptations.' It seems clear, then, that we have to revise our whole idea of the true nature and purpose of temptation, if we are to see daylight through this hard saying of St. James. How are we ever to regard these trials as anything else than a burden and a weariness? To this important query let me submit three answers which seem to shed some light on this puzzling statement of the most practical of all our New Testament teachers.

I. First of all, when we encounter trials, there is joy in the thought that *we have attained the dignity of morally responsible persons* and are not automata or human robots. To a morally sensitive soul every temptation must be a trial. Yet to be conscious of temptation and resist it is to rise in the human scale, and to be a man. Indeed, it might be called 'the pain of being a man,' and that always includes 'growing pains.' There should be grave disquietude in the mind of any person who feels no moral tension as he goes through life. Some people imagine that the better a man is, the less he has to struggle, and that the closer he is to God, the less he is tempted by Satan. They assume that the higher his ideal is, the less manifest is his failure to reach it, and that accordingly the net result will be that his conflict will be less intense. But this kind of reasoning is not true to the facts of experience. The fact is that the better a man is, the more involved he

becomes in that 'warfare from which there is no discharge.' But that should not depress or discourage us. Rather should it go to prove that we belong to a breed of men whom God is inviting to higher things, when He allows us to encounter trial. For the best experience of the race has taught us that among the various paths by which God conducts chosen souls, one is the way of temptation. Indeed, it would seem that there are 'classic' temptations which are reserved for souls of quality. 'Why do you sow my path with such difficulties?' St. Teresa of Avila once asked the Lord in petulant mood, and He replied, 'That is the way I treat my special friends, because they *are* my special friends. I will that they walk along the rugged road my own feet had to tread, the road to Calvary.' We may trust the saints in this matter. *They* know. But is there not a great thrill, I ask you, in all this for the aspiring soul?

II. There is joy in temptation for this reason also, that, when it is conquered, *the human character gains in strength and stability*. There is joy in wresting victory out of any encounter with potential evil. To quote Faber again, 'Temptations are the raw material of glory.' It is within our power to change trial into glorious gain. Robert Browning, who always puts iron into our blood, has helped us to take up the heroic attitude to all kinds of trial:

> And so I live, you see,
> Go through the world, try, prove, reject,
> Prefer, still struggling to effect
> My warfare; *happy that I can*
> *Be crossed and thwarted as a man.*

The all-important question is, what are these thwartings and apparent frustrations to effect within our souls? Are they to be for weal or for woe? Will they darken and defeat the spirit or, on the other hand, will they enrich and deepen the whole nature? Some sink under the stress of trial and temptation and are degraded. Others meet them and fight the good fight and are thereby made stronger. They make their frustrations fruitful. It was said of Mary, Queen of Scots, that 'everything—her wit, her beauty, her sorrow and her loneliness—everything became a weapon in her hands.' So in the battle of life, everything that happens to us, even the adverse things, may be a weapon in our hands for the overthrow of evil, and for an advance in true holiness—an occasion for the discovery of a more perfect faith and a stronger patience. It is deeply true that 'each victory will help us some other to win.' And even where there has been failure and defeat, and Satan has for the moment triumphed, even in such a dark hour as that there is a way to rise again and to fight better, for we may, as St. Augustine wrote, 'out of our dead sins make stepping-stones to rise to the heights of perfection.'

III. Finally, there is *joy in our trials and temptations because of the intimate comfort of God* which comes to the struggling soul. How very real is the joy which visits the hearts of those who are consoled of God! Words fail them to express it: yet without the temptation they should probably never have been sensible of the comfort.

How many sorely tried souls has John Bunyan, for example, helped through that intimate self-revelation which he gave us in *Grace Abounding*? (How precious were the gains which came to him, he has told us very plainly.) He had had a trying illness which was to him both a temptation and a trial. Indeed, it was a veritable 'Valley of the Shadow of Death,' in which his soul fell into great darkness; but it was by no means all loss. He was aware that it was only through trial that he could have got those priceless treasures of experience which he did receive. John Bunyan tells us that he 'was made continually to possess in his soul a very wonderful sense of the Being and Glory of God and of His beloved Son.' And so he found to his joy that, when he emerged from the dark valley and saw God's face in love, he was in possession of a wealth of comfort every bit of which he owed to the sternness of the conflict. George Macdonald, the Scottish novelist, had the self-same experience gained through bitter trials and losses. With health failing, suspected of heresy, his stipend reduced with the purpose of starving him out of his pastorate, he wrote in almost lyrical mood, 'The windows are all darkened except the skylight,' and to his devoted wife, 'There's a reason for this, and we shall be the better for it.'

Very often to our murmurings and complaints the answer which God vouchsafes is some experience which proves how great a boon the temptation or its permission was, though at the moment it is wrapped in mystery. 'Where wert Thou, Lord! while I was being tempted?' cried the saint of the desert. 'Close to you, My son, all the while,' was the tender reply. That is surely great gain and a solemn joy. Dr. Herbert Gray tells how as a young pastor he once asked an old man whether he would care to live his life over again on the condition that it would turn out exactly the same life as he had lived. He was prepared to hear a fervent 'God forbid,' knowing that that was what many would say. But, after thinking for a while this man replied deliberately, 'Yes, and especially would I like to live again through my times of trouble.' Then, when Dr. Gray asked, 'But why?' the old man replied, 'Because it was in those times that I learnt most of what I know of God.'

We are so apt to associate the experience of divine comfort with the sunshine and the rose-strewn path. But listen to what two sorrow-stricken souls exclaimed out of a full heart in the long ago: 'It is good for me that I have been afflicted.' 'Before I was afflicted, I went astray: but now have I kept thy word.' These men were not only delivered from the evil that lurks in every trial, but, further, the very trials they endured were over-ruled for higher ends in order that their own faith might be strengthened and the faith of others confirmed by the spectacle of their patience and that God Himself might be glorified.

PASSION SUNDAY.

Moses at the Burning Bush.

BY THE REVEREND CANON T. GUY ROGERS, B.D., M.C., RECTOR OF BIRMINGHAM.

'And the Lord said, I have surely seen the affliction of my people which are in Egypt, and have heard their cry by reason of their taskmasters; for I know their sorrows; And I am come down to deliver them out of the hand of the Egyptians, and to bring them up out of that land unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey; unto the place of the Canaanites, and the Hittites, and the Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the Jebusites.' —Ex $3^{7f.}$

The great scene in the desert ushers in the whole work of redemption. The Divine initiative flames out irresistible and unquenchable in human history. God speaks from the Bush that burns with fire and yet is not consumed. The majesty and holiness of God reveal themselves not to destroy but to save. The work of redemption has begun. Out of the mystery of the unknown, the unsearchable glory of the eternal world, the movement for man's redemption begins to take form and substance. The silence is broken, the dull world is aflame with light; earth becomes 'holy ground,' the high God comes down to His people.

We may not know what divinely inspired artist drew this picture of the revelation of God to Moses at the Burning Bush, or how the revelation first shaped itself in the mind and experience of Moses. Something of the kind was needed, some great spiritual experience, subjective or objective or more reasonably both, to account for his own redeeming work in leading God's people out of Egypt. But there are larger issues at stake than any local deliverance. The revelation which God here gives of Himself is the prelude, the sign manual of the work of redemption which culminates in the coming of Christ to be the Saviour of the world. God's voice is never silent, the flame of His presence burns steadily through the ages, the drama moves on its appointed way.

This is the starting point of religion as we Christians understand it. There is no escape from some postulate, justified later by experience, but accepted in the first instance on its own intrinsic merit by an act of human faith for which God is not without responsibility. The lack of argument about God in the Bible is significant. The Book of Job which would seem to be an exception falls back in the end upon a postulate. It is not the man who is seeking God but the God who is finding man who is the real protagonist in the story of the Bible. Man is seen as one who has gone astray or has broken a law or who has fallen into captivity or who is in a state of rebellion—always as some one who is in dire need of salvation. There is little to encourage the hope that he can adjust his conditions safely by his own efforts, that he can regain his freedom, repair his mistakes or satisfy the demands of a just and holy God by an elaborate system of self help. He is regarded throughout the Bible as a constant source of disappointment and irritation but at the same time as an object of compassion about whose welfare and redemption God is increasingly concerned. Hence the social and political history of the Jews centres round a series of deliverers and deliverances foreshadowing always a greater Deliverer and a greater Deliverance. Hence, too, their religious training is seen as a series of revelations, the Law revealed at Mount Sinai—the series of revelations to the Prophets—the Priestly Code to Ezekiel. God is always from the Hebraic point of view 'coming down' to teach, inspire, and, above all, to deliver His people.

That is what makes the Old Testament not merely a prelude or introduction to the New Testament but an organic part of a drama of redemption fulfilled in Christ. The Incarnation is a process in the mind of God heralded, foreshadowed and assumed throughout the ages. The Bush that burns with fire but is not consumed symbolizes the coming of the Eternal into the material world. The process is already at work.

As we study this Revelation of God to Moses at the Burning Bush we may study it under three headings. Here is revealed (1) a God that sees and hears; (2) a God that delivers; (3) a God that leads us into a great inheritance.

(1) *A God that sees and hears.* 'I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people.'

The particular background was the affliction of bondage—the cruel bondage of Egypt with its taskmasters, its floggings and its forced labour. The Christian conscience repudiates the agnostic or the deistic position. We proclaim a God vitally concerned about the social conditions under which people live—a God of Justice and Righteousness who takes note of what is happening in the world of His creation. Divine patience must not be mistaken for indifference. God 'sees and hears.' The spectacle of the homeless, the cry of the hungry, the destitute, and the oppressed—these are His concern.

But the particular background is always changing. There is a bondage of the spirit as irksome as the bondage to which the body may be subjected—the bondage of 'accidie' which takes the colour out of life. There are those 'who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.' God sees people not only as nations but persons, not only in the mass but as individuals. The 'afflictions' which trouble God's people are manifold. The first and fundamental note of comfort in the situation is that they are not unnoticed. We do not as Christians believe we live in a closed universe. Our condition can be seen, our cry heard.

(2) *A God that delivers.* 'I have seen, I have seen the affliction of my people and have come down to deliver them.'

Here is the Divine initiative proclaimed for the whole course of human history. The story is not exhausted by the story of Moses or Joshua. 'The time would fail me,' says the writer of the Hebrews, 'to tell of Gedeon, and of Barak, and of Samson, and of Jephthae; of David also, and

Samuel, and of the prophets.' These imperfect people and their transient deliverance point on to the deliverance achieved in Christ. We must read the gospel story not simply for its ethical teaching or its broad humanity but as a crusade on the part of God. The old Schoolmen may have erred in their conceptions of from whom and from what God's people were rescued by Christ but they had their grip on essentials in thinking of the coming of Christ as the outcome of a Divine initiative whose purpose was salvation. It is in Christ that each individual becomes a new creation, in Him centres the hope of a new heaven and a new earth. Just as the background of the particular kind of bondage from which man suffers differs in different cases, so the foreground of the particular kind of salvation into which man is brought varies according to his previous need. God in Christ deals not only with sin and the sense of guilt but with weakness, perplexity, dissipation of energy, and all the other ills which disfigure or imprison human personality.

(3) *A God that leads us into a great inheritance.* The original promise at the Burning Bush was that the people should be brought out of the land of bondage ' unto a good land and a large, unto a land flowing with milk and honey.' The contents of the promise are conditioned by the circumstances. Canaan takes the place of Egypt, the march through the desert is to lead to a fertile land. The picture of the inheritance into which God leads His people is kept well within the experience of those to whom it is given. But the point is that no one who is delivered is left in a vacuum. There is always a preposition to be added to the word salvation. We are saved ' from.' We are saved ' for.' We are saved ' into.' In other words, we are led into a great inheritance. The man who has been saved ' from ' sinning knows at once that he has been saved ' for ' service and saved ' into ' the fellowship of Christ's Church. He is ' led ' into a fertile land of spiritual experience.

It is not surprising that when the Bush burns with fire and yet is not consumed God's gifts should be endless or our experience unlimited. We should not expect meagre results or a pinch-penny kind of salvation. When God saves people He does not treat them as displaced persons or leave them in internment camps to exist on insufficient spiritual calories. They are treated as heirs of a great inheritance. All that is implied in fellowship with God, as interpreted in prayer and sacraments and service, is at their disposal. All the confidence in facing life and death and the hereafter which belongs to God's children is theirs. All the deepening experience of being led by the spirit of God is open to them. In the words of the Confirmation Service it is their privilege daily to ' increase in Thy Holy Spirit until they come into Thy heavenly Kingdom.' The long sojourn in the wilderness which followed the deliverance from Egypt was no part of God's intention for His people. The delay was due to disobedience and lack of faith. The Land of Promise was there for them and is there for us to be claimed immediately—the good land of spiritual experience.

Still to this day the Bush burns with fire. God is still revealing Himself in Christ. ' He has visited and redeemed his people ' and what He hath done is still being done and will be done. The Bush will still burn and the Bush is not consumed.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE EASTER.

Intimate Religion.

' Jesus took bread . . . and he took the cup.'—Mt $26^{26.\ 27}$.

' He . . . took a towel.'—Jn 13^{4}.

There was homeliness about the meal in the Upper Room, for Jesus took bread and took the cup, and after supper He took a towel and girded Himself to wash up, but it was not dishes that He washed—it was the feet of the disciples. Bread, a cup, a towel, these represented the daily life of the household, and when our Lord used them as the symbols of His saving grace He desired to domesticate religion, and to endear it as a sweet intimacy.

The supernatural has too often been conceived as the ghostly and the eerie, and religion has frequently embodied itself in magical ceremonies, mysterious oracles, and uncanny pomp, which act as spell-binders and produce the blinkered mind. People may feel awed, without understanding and loving and being changed in heart and life. Jesus used such homely symbols as bread, a cup, and a towel, because He intended to domesticate religion and impart it to the familiar fare and to our workaday experience. More than that, He meant that our relations with God should not be sporadic and occasional, but should be as regular as the routine of the household.

' *Jesus took bread.*' He called Himself ' the bread of life,' and why ? It was because He wished to impress on people that His gospel and His power were as indispensable to the survival of humanity as daily bread. The finer feelings, which distinguish us from the animal order, will perish without the Christian revelation, which is as needful as regular food. Thackeray has a character in one of his novels who thus described the dehumanising effect of hunger. ' While my wife was weeping over her child, I am ashamed to say I was distracted with other feelings besides those of grief for its loss ; and I have often since thought what a master—nay, destroyer—of the affections want is, and have learned from experience to be thankful for *daily bread.*' Similarly, what is more human, kindly, and lovable in people is famished and dies without the Divine food. Jesus knew that converse with the God of love, the forgiveness of sins, the insight and power to deal effectively with snarling evils and to conquer lower instincts which we inherit from our animal ancestry, the trained sympathies which are eager to help and befriend, were all as necessary as daily bread, if human life was to have health, dignity, and promise, and to be worth living. He saw that humanity could not last without Him. Did He not say, ' Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth

out of the mouth of God?' As Emil Brunner puts it: 'Man has spirit only in that he is addressed by God. The humanity of man rests in nothing else than the Divine word addressed to him.' Even a psycho-analyst like Freud says that with the decay of religion nervous troubles multiply and deepen, and admits that were there no religion we should have to invent one if man's heart is to be satisfied. So religion ought to be the constant diet, the usual fare, for who can keep well and fit without regular meals? Our religion must be domesticated and be applied to homely needs, problems, and tasks as a transforming inspiration, a saving impulse.

Jesus broke the bread as an intimation that His body would be broken in a violent death and a costly sacrifice. But why should His body be broken, why should He lay down His life? Because evil is a killer, cutting down truth, humaneness, progress, and happiness, and Jesus was willing to die rather than submit to the foul pretender who usurped the power of God. Jesus defied evil, He suffered, and He won. Yes, and so can we, by committing ourselves to Him.

'*He took the cup.*' Jesus accompanied the symbolic action with the explanation, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood.' The old covenant was confined to one race, the Hebrews, and it gave them a sense of security. In his novel, *The Nazarene*, Sholem Asch tells how a Roman officer was impressed by the faith which the Palestinian Jews had in God in all their troubles, and sometimes it angered the Roman, sometimes filled him with envy, because it made the Jews so confident and irrepressible. But the new covenant is not restricted to one nation, it includes all mankind and every individual. It is for each person, and must be domesticated and intimate, if it is to make us indomitable.

The world to-day is strewn with broken pledges and violated covenants. During the Middle Ages, the Pope gave kings the right to break treaties, but it was to the credit of Edward I that he took as his motto, '*Serva pactum*,' keep troth, be true to your word. The God in whom we believe keeps troth with the unworthy, the unloving, and the unfit, and it gives us peace of mind to know that we are in the keeping of One who can be trusted absolutely. His covenant of faithful love is the stabilizing factor amid the surge and whirl of lawlessness. It is His forgiveness and His patience, His reconciling constancy, and it cost Him the death of His Son. It is life rallied and reinforced by a faithful God that is offered in this cup, and if we let God take over the control of our life, then none of us need ever be an ineffective man or an ineffective woman again. 'Drink ye all of it,' says Jesus, holding out the cup, and how could we resist His handsome love? We drink as covenantors, who register our vows to be allies of God's will and confederates of His purpose, and we are sworn in anew to His service.

'*He took a towel.*' After supper, Jesus took a towel, and girded Himself, and washed the disciples' feet to remove the travel-stains, to take away the tired feeling, to relieve their fatigue, and to make them fresh and fit for the road once more, that they might step out like men on the roughest journey. This He did as an example to the Twelve that they must stoop to homely service which would revive others, and never think themselves above cleaning up the dirty passages of life, if thereby they were refreshing and restoring weary lives. The towel which our Lord took was a homely rebuke to the hauteur which supposes certain services are beneath it and grudges to make sacrifices that would keep shaken folk on their feet.

If Divine love were not so homely as to bend down to our level, how could we ever feel the purifying, reviving touch of God which fits us to stand up to things? If the almighty power of God is not merciful enough to domesticate itself, how can any of us be cleansed and restored? Our soiled, exhausted nature can be washed only by the Divine love which stoops to serve and save. 'I came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.' The towel was a token of grace getting down to its redeeming work, and Jesus replied to Peter's remonstrance, 'If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.'

'No part with me'—that decides it. We know that it would be unbearable to be separated from the Divine, cut off by a deadly distance and an impassable gulf.

> Fear fills my heart that I may be
> One day an alien from Thy door,
> May cease Thy lovely face to see,
> And hear Thy whisper nevermore.

It is what we should fear most. Then we must take the bread, the cup, and the towel as symbols of the Divine love which will be shed abroad in our hearts and will transform our lives.[1]

Easter Day.

Easter—Comfort or Challenge?

By the Reverend H. G. Newsham, M.A., Edinburgh.

'That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.'—Ph $3^{10f.}$.

The references to Easter in the New Testament urgently recall the members of Christ's Church to something which we are ever in danger of forgetting. It is this. Easter was never regarded, in the first days of the Faith, merely as a wonderful fact to be acclaimed and celebrated. It was never regarded simply as an ecstatic cause for jubilation. It was regarded, rather, as a most arresting challenge. It was an event of history which threw a vividly piercing searchlight upon all human life and purpose and hope. It was a world-shaking act of God which demanded men should do something drastic about it; revise their every idea and standard and aim in the light of it. The Resur-

[1] Arthur A. Cowan, *Crisis on the Frontier*, 152.

rection, for Paul, implied something of incomparable significance for every man here and now, in this life and in this earthly citizenship, no less than in that which is to come. The true inference from the Resurrection is much more profound than a simple message about the morning of joy following the night of sorrow, or about the sure and certain hope of the life beyond the grave. All this, of course, is involved in it; is a thrilling part of it; but it isn't the first or the principal concern.

Then if not, what is? The words of Paul supply the answer, 'That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings . . . If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead.' There are two supremely important issues here which must be underlined as thickly as possible.

The first is Paul's phrase 'the power of the resurrection.' The power! What Easter Day proved to the disciples, to Paul, and to Christians ever since, was not something about ourselves, but something about God. It demonstrated what Good Friday—which would never have been called Good had Easter never happened—seemed to have disproved for all time: it demonstrated the mighty power of God. The Early Church, and Christianity generally, because of Greek influence, came to be interested in the idea of immortality; that is to say, in the idea that there is a spiritual element in man which is inherently immortal. It survives the shock and change of death. But the Bible as a whole, and Christianity when most true to itself, does not greatly concern itself with the truth or the falsity of that particular speculation. What it is concerned about is neither 'survival' nor 'immortality,' but Resurrection. It is the Power and the Love of God that is the burning heart and centre of the Christian Faith. The Power of God that can resurrect, can raise up, can recreate, what appears to be dead and done for! That, it will be remembered, was Jesus' insistence when He was asked a trick question about the nature of the life to come. He replied that the questioners were in serious error because they did not know the power and resources of God. He staked the entire issue, not upon some quality or attribute within the make-up of man, but upon the unsearchable power and wisdom of God. This power it was which the resurrection of Jesus from the dead demonstrated in life-changing manner for the disciples. Henceforth, they lived in the certainty of the illimitable power of the living God, who could infuse strength into weaklings, make the dry sticks of tradition sappy and green again, clothe the dead bones of institutionalism with eager flesh and blood again, and raise up what was entombed, decaying, moribund, dead. It was in that faith the Apostles went forth conquering. In that faith Christians have possessed a power which has defied the principalities and powers of the world. In that faith Christians have faced martyrdom, or the natural term of their earthly years, trusting in the power of God, which raised up Jesus from the dead, to raise up everything, whether physical, mental or spiritual, which in His love and wisdom it were right and good for them should be raised up.

So the first inference from Easter is not so much the immortality of the soul as the amazing power and the unpredictable resources of God. Life, after Easter, was lived with that conviction colouring the Christian's entire outlook both upon this present earthly sphere and upon that which is to come.

The second fact which Easter announced to Paul, with the sound of a trumpet, was this. It was not *any* sort of a life through which the power of God had been displayed in this awesome way, even as it was not to any one or every one that the Resurrection certainty had come. No—it was this life of Jesus; this life of selfless love; this life utterly surrendered to the rule and realm of God on earth; this life that gave Itself for a Kingdom founded upon principles which cut clean across so many of the accepted codes and practices of men and nations; this Jesus, who had embodied in His very life, and pre-eminently upon the Cross, the strange glory of that Kingdom. He it was who had been raised up by God from the dead. There was then—this was the immediate inference—a kind of life which God would not permit to see corruption. There was a Divine purpose God would not suffer to know defeat. There was a Kingdom which had behind it the eternal passion of God Himself, and not all the conspiracy of the engines and agencies of evil, though they might do their foulest, and might seem for an hour victorious, could finally defy it. God could weave into the very design and fabric of His purpose the darkest crimes of the adversary, yes, even the Cross itself.

Then, if so, what follows? Surely this. What matters now, beyond all else in life, is to be a partner, and not an opponent, nor a neutral, in the Divine purpose. The Resurrection has revealed the absolute harmony of the life of Jesus with God. Then the meaning of life for us men is to know Jesus better; to share His crusade; to possess the same mind, the same concern, the same objectives, the same all dominating passion, as were His. 'That I may know Him, and the power of His Resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, and be made conformable to His death . . . die to the worldly interests to which He was dead, and live for the things which were to Him the very heart of His being . . . if, by any means, I might attain unto the Resurrection of the dead.' Those intense words have a haunting reverberation. If . . . by any means . . . I might attain. There is nothing whatsoever of a light-hearted acceptance of a casual creed within an utterance of that kind. To sing 'Jesus Christ is risen to-day' to a grand tune which sets the echoes ringing, and then to disperse carelessly to our homes and business, with a sort of 'all's well' feeling inside us, would have seemed to Paul a blindness of mind, an insensitivity of soul, a renewed crucifying of Christ, which would have taxed even his vocabulary to pillory. If! By any means!! I might attain!!! These are words of trembling aspiration and of solemn self-

commitment, uttered in the radiance of a hope too incredible for thought, yet, by the Grace of God, shining henceforth so as no cloud can shadow it.

If, then, Easter is to be to us what it ought to be, we must be stabbed awake by these words of Paul. We must be made to appreciate that a jubilant acclamation of the Risen Christ, with comforting thoughts about the Larger Hope, and nothing more, face to face with this stupendous happening, is shamefully insufficient. There should be, first, the rooting and grounding of our minds in the knowledge of God's aweful and incalculable power, of which the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead is the crowning proof and evidence. And then there should follow the fervent prayer that our lives may be rooted and grounded in the purpose of God, revealed to us uniquely in the words and life of Him whom God raised up . . . if . . . by any means . . . you and I also . . . might attain . . . by some miracle of grace.

The Principle of Coherence in the Gospel Story.

(*Continued.*)

By the Reverend Roderic Dunkerley, B.D., Ph.D., Hockley, Essex.

II.

It will be necessary to deal more briefly with our 'minor coherents,' but I hope enough will be said to substantiate my argument that they fit in so admirably to the outline of the picture already put together that the consistency and coherence of the whole makes its general accuracy and historicity highly probable. We begin with some elements in the story which, like the twelve already dealt with, appear to be necessary to it though in a somewhat lesser degree, so that one can almost anticipate finding them at certain points in the narrative, and some surprise would be felt if they or something like them were not there.

The first three belong to the early Galilean days.

(13) *Popular Excitement and Enthusiasm* (Mk $1^{27.\ 28}$ $2^{1.\ 2}$ $3^{9.\ 10.\ 20}$ 4^{1}, etc.).

(14) *Early Signs of Hindrances to Success* (Mk $2^{6.\ 7.\ 16}$ 4^{3-7}, etc.).

(15) *The Resentment of His Family* (Mk $3^{21.\ 31-35}$).

Such preaching and such 'mighty works' inevitably created a furore—it could not possibly have been otherwise, and the dramatic descriptions of it are perfectly natural; to call them editorial links between isolated fragments is perverse. But excitement is not acceptance, and in view of the failure of Galilee to repent and accept the message some traces might be expected quite early in the story that everything was not working out well according to hope. The Parable of the Sower suggests the variety of difficulties by which He was soon confronted, even though, as we have seen, He still hoped for a successful outcome and an abundant harvest. I cannot see any good reason for thinking that Mark has grouped together stories of opposition out of their historical sequence rather than that he had information that antagonism soon developed along these lines, and, in view of the excitement and hostility combined, action by His relations almost necessarily followed.

News of all this would inevitably spread more and more widely, and presently the authorities would take notice of what was happening. It is therefore no surprise to find

(16) *The Deputation of Scribes from Jerusalem* (Mk $3^{22f.}$).

(17) *The Alarm of Herod and the Court* (Mk 3^{6} 6^{14}).

The religious leaders in the capital were bound to take cognisance of the apparent emergence in Israel of a new prophet (cf. Jn $1^{19f.}$), whether or not the provincial scribes sent to headquarters asking for assistance; if these Jerusalem scribes had not appeared on the scene at this stage, we could have properly asked—What did Jerusalem think about what was taking place up north? As to Herod, there were obviously the makings of political trouble in a popular movement of this sort with excited crowds gathering; there would have been an odd gap in the story if the secular authorities had not appeared in the background somewhere about this stage of its development.

That Jesus should visit His old home town seems almost a matter of course.

(18) *The Visit to Nazareth* (Mk 6^{1-6}).

We have already noticed His surprise and disappointment at the outcome; there is no inconsistency in the facts that He realized His reception was in accordance with tradition, so to speak, but that He hoped to triumph over tradition and save His old friends from making the old fatal mistake. After all, was He not more than a prophet?

The next two passages follow from the fact of the official opposition of the religious leaders :

(19) *The Break with the Synagogue.*

(20) *The Final Conflict in Galilee* (Mk 7^{1-23}).

No passages are quoted for (19) because though Mk 3^{7} may indicate the beginnings of this break, as Burkitt [1] suggested, yet the real evidence of it is in the fact that from now on His work seems almost entirely outside the synagogues. There was probably no official ban on Him, for it would almost certainly have been mentioned in the records if there had been, but that He should now prefer an unhampered approach to the people on the shores and hillsides seems quite natural. A final tussle also with the scribes is demanded by the transition of the story from Galilee to Jerusalem, and we find this dramatically told in (20). It should be noticed how He took the offensive and, calling the people to Him, boldly declared that the whole accepted view of ' clean and unclean ' was untrue. The fundamental nature of the dispute makes it clear that a climax had been reached. If this story had occurred at any other point than just here at the end of the Galilean period it would have been incoherent, and the Form Critics might have been right. It is exactly where it is needed if the picture is to be a consistent whole.

The next passage follows closely from (17) ; if Herod were seriously alarmed at the campaign of Jesus we should naturally expect him to take some action. The absence of even the threat of this in Mark has appeared strange, but Luke supplies the missing piece of information.

(21) *Jesus threatened by Herod* (Lk 13^{31-33}).

The old idea of a Perean ministry has of course rightly now been discarded ; this whole section of Luke clearly gives mainly Galilean reminiscences from a different source than that or those available to Mark. Parts of the section, and in particular this passage, seem to belong to the central period of the ministry before the final clash (20).

The last two items in this division of our material belong to the last days at Jerusalem, and follow inevitably from His actions there (passages 8, 9, 10).

(22) *The Challenge by the Authorities* (Mk 11^{27-33}, and parallels).

(23) *The Denunciation of the Scribes* (Mk 13^{38-40}, Mt 23^{1-33}).

After His dramatic entry into the city and His high-handed action in the Temple, the authorities either had to challenge Him at once or lose face with the people. He was of course ready for them, and His extraordinarily clever riposte completely routed their attack, but made the issue yet more certain and so finally determined his death. Our final passage may appear less integral to the story, but if we have entered deeply into the tragedy of what was happening (and this takes us back again to our three original passages, 1, 2, 3) we could surely almost guess that His last public utterance would be something in the nature of a ' showdown ' with the men who more than any others were to blame for the tragedy—who could and should have recognized the Light when it came into the world but who loved darkness rather than light. I think Matthew preserves a true memory of the intensity of the feeling of Jesus at this time—in full accord with His tears at the gates of the city, and later in the garden.

[1] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, 80.

III.

We come next to a further group of ' minor coherents ' which are not as inevitable, so to speak, as those we have been considering, but which fall very readily into the pattern of the picture that is now taking shape and seem to fit in rather remarkably at exact points in the story.

I begin with a factor of considerable importance in the Gospels, which it may be thought should have been noticed earlier ; I have left it till now because it does not arise directly or appear to be required by the evolution of the story in the way that the previous passages do.

(24) *The Preaching and Baptism of John.*

The importance of John's work is mainly that it provides a background to the mission of Jesus, and helps to give content to His proclamation of the Kingdom. I believe that in estimating the purpose of John and the significance of his baptism, Ezk 36 has been strangely neglected—a great passage in which the prophet in God's name promised a sacramental cleansing as a prelude to the coming of a new and better order for Israel. Now, when the powers of worldliness in the person of Herod struck at this new movement, and John was clapped into prison, Jesus immediately stepped into the breach, and at the centre of Herod's domain proclaimed ' the acceptable year of the Lord.'

This leads on to our next passage.

(25) *The Disappointment of John* (Mt 11^{2-6}, Lk 7^{19-23}).

In the Isaiah quotation which Jesus used to declare His ' programme ' (see passage 5), we find the words ' to proclaim liberty to the captives and the opening of the prison to them that are bound ' ; Luke's version rather obscures what looks like a purposed allusion to John's imprisonment, and which must almost certainly have been so understood by those who heard the words read so soon after it had taken place. It is integral to the conception of the life of Jesus which I am expounding that He cherished hopes of a great spiritual

response from the people, and we are bound to ask what would have happened if that had been yielded. Might there not have been an outburst of intense fervour and enthusiastic devotion to God's will, before which Herod would have quailed ? I believe that something like that was within the purposes of Jesus and that we cannot give real content to His disappointment—as we have seen, a fundamental point in the story—unless we allow for this. We feel no surprise then that John should be dismayed when so far as he was concerned nothing happened.

Our next point is

(26) *The Call and Mission of the Twelve* (Mk 3^{13-19} 6^{7-13}, and parallels).

We could not have anticipated that this would be the great counterstroke of Jesus to the growing opposition, but the wisdom and skill of the move are obvious ; it meant an intensification of effort, and a determination to spread the good news of God's purpose far and wide as quickly as possible. We should notice the urgency in the directions given to them ; it was the King's business, and it required haste. The solemn issues involved are also stressed (Mk 6^{12}). Both these points are strikingly in harmony with His anticipations of success which, as I have argued, still remained at this stage of His life—before the final clash in Galilee, and so before the final appeal to Jerusalem.

Here we must consider the important

(27) *Parable of the Fig Tree* (Lk 13^{6-9}).

We have already considered the other Parable on the ' vineyard ' theme—a familiar illustration of God's relationship with the Jewish people (Is 5^{1-7}). Though we can hardly call this one as essential to the story as the later passage (10), yet its aptness in the centre of the ministry of Jesus is undeniable ; it exactly represents the half-way moment, so to speak, in the development of events, when there was still a possibility of a national response, though the prospect of it was receding. It was of these two Parables that I said in my previous article that they are in their proper places in the story, and that if their positions were reversed the whole thing would be chaotic and incoherent.

Sometime after John's message (25) there occurred

(28) *The Execution of John* (Mk 6^{21-29}, Mt 14^{6-12}).

This was obviously a critical event for Jesus because it was proof that in spite of the mission of the Twelve (26), the Galileans were failing to respond in the degree required if God's power was to be released, and His purposes realized. It is closely associated by Mark with the return of the Twelve (6^{30}), and it seems reasonable to see it as leading on to Herod's threat (21), Jesus' lament over Galilee (1), and the final conflict there (20). All these together made a change of plan imperative, and our next passage therefore fits in at this point in the story like a piece of a jigsaw for which the surrounding pieces seem to be waiting expectantly.

(29) *The Withdrawal from Galilee* (Mk $7^{24f.}$).

It might have been thought that He would proceed at once to Jerusalem to launch there His final campaign, but a little consideration will show why this had to be postponed for a while. We cannot perhaps lay much stress on hints that the Passover was at hand, but if it was and if, as is probable, Jesus felt it necessary that it should be at Passover time that He made His great appeal to the city, we can see why that immediate Passover was too soon for His purpose. There was much to be done before His disciples were ready for the crisis—perhaps even before He Himself were ready. So it is no surprise to find here

(30) *The Transfiguration* (Mk 9^{2-8}, and parallels).

(31) *The Training of the Twelve.*

When psychology grows up, it may help us to understand the Transfiguration better than we do at present, but we can already say that it seems altogether natural that at such a crisis He should have an ecstatic experience of communion and comfort and re-assurance and re-commission. No passages are quoted for (31) because quite a lot of material appears to belong here, including the mystery of His messiahship, and warnings of the possibility of coming tragedy both for Himself and for them. We may remark on the naturalness of one point ; if there was an inner circle of disciples (Mk 5^{37} 9^{2}), to whom He was able to impart more than to the rest it is easy to understand why dissension should arise on the question of precedence and priority (Mk $9^{33f.}$). Luke may or may not be right in saying that the same kind of thing happened at the Last Supper, but *pace* the Form Critics this incident ' belongs ' just here.

Our next two passages prepare the way for the final scenes at Jerusalem.

(32) *Journeying Secretly towards Jerusalem* (Mk 9^{30}, Lk 9^{52}, etc.).

(33) *The Pharisees' Ambush* (Mk 10^{2-12}).

When He was satisfied that the time of preparation must end and the last great attempt be made at Jerusalem, it was natural that He should desire to visit Galilee once more—perhaps as much for the disciples' sake as for His own or more—but it was equally natural that He should do so incognito, the reasons which had compelled His withdrawal remaining operative. It would have been very damaging to His whole purpose to have been arrested by Herod. So, too, was it necessary for Him to travel south by the unwonted route through Samaria rather than by the regular pilgrims' road across Jordan—in Herod's domain. It is a singular mark of the coherence and histori-

city of the story that these points are so evident here. When He did at last appear again in public, His enemies were quick to attack, endeavouring to entrap Him with the tricky question of divorce in the hope that He might become embroiled with Herod. I find Burkitt's study of this matter completely convincing.[1]

The last three passages to which I call attention belong to the closing hours of His life :

(34) *His Last Words with His Friends.*

(35) *The Agony in the Garden* (Mk 14^{32-42}, and parallels).

(36) *The Daughters of Jerusalem* (Lk 23^{27-31}).

I have not given references for (34) because there is a considerable amount of teaching which seems exceedingly appropriate at this point—more so on our reading of the story than on the more usual interpretations. The so-called ' little apocalypse ' (Mk 13), which is so often taken to belong to the middle of the first century, seems to me to give a needed warning at this stage that the nation's rejection of Him would inevitably lead to catastrophe, including persecution for them, but also a strong assurance that God's purposes remained whatever else passed away, and that the world's summertime would certainly come (*v.*[28]). There are no doubt some dislocations and some later embellishments employing apocalyptic imagery rather freely, but the heart of the message belongs here. The scene in the Garden means to me that with the awfulness of the tragedy upon His heart and an intense realization of what it all would involve not so much for Him and His friends as for the nation and unborn generations, He searched His soul once again as to whether even at that last moment of the eleventh hour there might not be some other way out ; He was ready personally because He could not possibly choose to be silenced rather than to be slain—but the strain was terrible, including as it did the thought of ' what might have been.' The last passage is very significant, and is often overlooked. There was still life and possible fruitfulness in the tree of Judaism—His harvest hope had been soundly based—and yet they were committing this ghastly sin ; what awful things lay ahead then when the tree became dry and dead ?

Here, then, are our coherents, major and minor. I do not, of course, intend to suggest that no other passages fit into the pattern of the picture thus outlined ; on the contrary, I find that a great many others do, just as a child after assembling the main pieces of a puzzle finds that many other little pieces drop into place and give unexpected content to the scene. But these seem to coalesce so naturally that there is a presumption that they belong to each other, and that the resultant picture is historically sound. Some of my links between passages may appear inconclusive to some readers, but I believe that most will find the cumulative effect convincing.

[1] *Op. cit.*, 98 f.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Paradise Story. To the many discussions of The Story of the Garden of Eden Professor P. A. H. de Boer has added a brief study, but one marked by some original ideas.[1] It is written in Dutch but there is a short summary in French. He holds that the word ' tree ' in the expression ' tree of life ' is collective, as it clearly is in Gn $3^{2.9}$, and that we should therefore render ' the trees of life.' These were not placed ' in the midst of the garden,' but ' within the garden,' and the phrase בְּתוֹךְ הַגָּן in 2^{9} should be so translated. In the same verse, where the Hebrew text, rendered literally, has ' and the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil,' he gives a different sense to the two occurrences of ' and,' rendering ' namely, the trees of life in the garden, including the tree of knowledge of good and evil.' He holds that the expression ' thou shalt surely die,' in 2^{17} does not imply that the mortality of man is the consequence of his first disobedience, and predicates neither immortality nor mortality of his first state. It is a *terminus technicus* for a penal death. The author therefore interprets 3^{22} in an original way, rendering ' all his life,' instead of ' for ever.' To avoid the tautology of ' live all his life,' he interprets the verse to mean that man is henceforth forbidden to live easily by feeding on the life-giving trees of the garden without labour. The entire narrative is ascribed by de Boer to the Elohist, and not to the Jahvist, as is customary in modern works, and he thinks the introduction of the name Yahweh is secondary. The whole story, which has left no traces in the rest of the Old Testament arose in a peasant milieu, but by reason of certain points of contact with the theological ideas of the Yahwist —in particular the idea of the Creator, and of the

[1] *Genesis II en III : het veerhaal van den hof in Eden* (1941). Brill, Leiden.

littleness of man before God—the name Yahweh was introduced into it.

It is improbable that all of these ideas will commend themselves to succeeding writers, though there are some that will certainly demand examination. That the expression ' thou shalt surely die ' could in itself perfectly well mean ' thou shalt be put to death ' is doubtless true, but that it has that meaning in this context seems improbable. For on de Boer's view, the penalty incurred was not death but toil. Moreover, as against this, it should be remembered that already in 2^{15}, before his sin, man is placed in the garden ' to dress it '—and even if we should render, with de Boer, ' to cultivate and to guard the trees,' the case is no better. Work was man's lot from the beginning, but as the result of his sin it was transferred to a grimmer milieu. There is, indeed, a measure of inconcinnity in the story, as many writers have found, and man's exclusion from the garden lest he should eat of the tree of life and live for ever certainly implies that he was not inherently immortal before the curse.

The Prophets and the Creation. In 1945 there was published a Dutch monograph on the Traditions of the Creation, as preserved in the Prophetic Books.[1] At the end of the volume there is a brief summary in German and in English. The author, Dr. H. A. Brongers began to study the traces of the Pentateuch in the Minor Prophets, but ended by restricting his interests to the Creation and extending his sphere to the whole prophetic canon. In the event he discovered but few direct references to the Creation, and these were found to yield nothing inconsistent with what we find in Gn 1.

The author offers a careful and critical study of all the passages he uses, examining not alone the form of the text but the authenticity of the passages in their present context. At the outset he studies the passage in Genesis whose traces he seeks. This is the first account of the Creation, which Brongers holds to be a unity, and not to rest on the idea of a divine creation *ex nihilo*. Gn 1^1 he holds to be a title for the passage, and the account of the Creation therefore begins with the already existing formless waste. This view is not new, and is probably true. It is more doubtful, however, whether Brongers is right in equating the verbs ברא, עשה and יצר, on the ground that they often stand in parallelism with one another in poetry. Parallel terms are not necessarily exact synonyms, and while Gn 1 nowhere stresses that Creation was *ex nihilo*, it does seem to imply that the mere fiat of God was enough to effect the process of Creation, and that His activity was the activity of will alone.

In the prophetic books there are few references to the details of Creation, save in Deutero-Isaiah, where they are more numerous than anywhere else. Yet even here there is no interest in Creation as a historical process, but merely as a demonstration of the power of God and an inspiration to confidence in Him. It is a parænetic interest, and not a scientific interest, which moves the prophet.

There are chapters on the traditions in Amos, in Isaiah, in Jeremiah, and in Deutero-Isaiah, and a chapter summing up the conclusions of the study. In the course of the chapters on Amos we have a useful discussion of some of the mythological material provided by Babylonian and Syrian (Ras Shamra) sources for the elucidation of references found in the prophets, and especially for the reference to the passage of the Serpent on the bottom of the sea. Here Brongers notes the differences between the various traditions. The Babylonian *Enuma elish* is a creation myth, while the Labbu myth recounts a post-creation conflict. In neither of these is there any occurrence of the names Rahab, Leviathan or Tannin which the monster bears in various Old Testament texts. For Leviathan and Tannin he goes to the Ras Shamra texts, but without deducing any far-reaching conclusions from this. If the prophets used motifs which belonged to the Canaanite mythology, they did not surrender their own originality.

For the meagreness of the references to the Creation the author offers the probable explanation that the Israelites were more interested in history than in Nature, and that their dominant thought is of a revelation given in the events of the Exodus and the Covenant of Sinai. At the end of his study there is an Excursus on JHWH Ṣebaoth, and another on the structure of the universe in Hebrew thought. These are not summarized in German or English. In the former of these he lists all the occurrences of the term, and opposes Eichrodt's view that the title had any reference to the Ark and its use on the field of battle, but concludes that the original reference of the term Ṣebaoth is lost.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

[1] *De scheppingstradities bij de Profeten* (1945). H. J. Paris, Amsterdam.

Contributions and Comments.

The Position of the Wild Beasts in Revelation vi. 8b.

When the Lamb had opened the fourth seal of the book that lay on God's right hand there came forth a pale horse. 'And he that sat upon him, his name was Death; and Hades followed with him. And there was given unto them authority over the fourth part of the earth, to kill with sword, and with famine, and with pestilence, and by the wild beasts of the earth.'

It is now recognized that this statement about permission to kill with sword and other instruments of judgment applies, not to Death and Hades who have just been mentioned in *v.*[8a], but to all the Horsemen of *vv.*[1-8a].

Archdeacon Charles does not mention this way of taking *v.*[8b]; he applies it to *v.*[8a] (where he deletes the clause about Hades), and deals in a most drastic manner with its text.

But surely *v.*[8b] is a summary of *vv.*[1-8a]. Sword, famine, and pestilence are associated respectively with the second, the third, and the fourth Horsemen. War kills with sword, and, with justifiable licence, the third and fourth Riders, who represent Famine and Pestilence, are said to kill with famine and pestilence.

But what of 'the wild beasts of the earth'? There cannot be much doubt that the four Riders correspond respectively to four of the Signs of the Zodiac—the Lion, the Virgin, the Balance, and the Scorpion. In the cycle of twelve years into which, according to astrological conceptions then current, time was divided (each of the twelve years being ruled over by one of the Signs of the Zodiac) a feature of the year of the Lion was supposed to be 'an epiphany of wild beasts' (see J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Johannine Writings*, 107).

If, then, the wild beasts pertain to the first seal why are they placed last? All that Estlin Carpenter says on this point is 'We cannot tell.' Their position at the end of the list is certainly curious, and one feels that it cannot be accidental seeing that the sword, famine, and pestilence come in the order of the second, third, and fourth Riders.

In the various Old Testament enumerations of these four devastations the order is never that of our text. In Ezk 5[16. 17] we find famine, beasts, pestilence, blood. In Ezk 14[21] where the Lord speaks of His 'four sore judgments' the order is sword, famine, noisome beasts, pestilence. In *vv.*[13. 15. 17. 19] respectively of Ezk 14 the same four plagues are mentioned in the order famine, wild beasts, sword, pestilence. In Lv 26[22-26] the order is wild beasts, sword, pestilence, famine.

The suggestion is sometimes offered that the wild beasts are placed last in John's list because as a matter of fact wild beasts become destructive when the population has been reduced by other devastations (cf. Dt 7[22]). But this thought has not affected any of the Old Testament lists to which reference has just been made.

Is it possible that John's order is derived from Psalms of Solomon 13[2. 3]? There we read:

(2) 'The arm of the Lord hath saved us from
the sword that passed through,
From famine and the death of sinners.
(3) Noisome beasts ran upon them:
With their teeth they tore their flesh,
And with their molars crushed their bones.
But from all these things the Lord delivered
us.'

In Charles's *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (ii. 645) Dr. G. Buchanan Gray suggests that the Greek text at the end of *v.*[2] and the beginning of *v.*[3] may be the result of a wrong division of the original Hebrew text. The latter, he thinks, 'may have run "from famine and pestilence; as for sinners, noisome beasts," etc.' 'In that case,' he adds, 'the passage refers to the four plagues of Ezk xiv. 21.' And the order, it will be seen, is that in which they appear in John's list. It may be worth noting that in Rendel Harris's rendering of the Syriac text of the Psalm 'the pestilence of sinners' answers to *θανάτου ἁμαρτωλῶν* in the Greek.

There cannot be much doubt that the writer of the Apocalypse was acquainted with this little Psalm, which in the Greek text is described as *παράκλησις τῶν δικαίων*. In it are contrasted the security of the righteous and the destruction that awaits the sinner. It may well have been a source of comfort and strength to John in the dark days of persecution. And its list of the judgments from which the Lord had delivered His people may well have been fixed in his mind.

J. Hugh Michael.

Emmanuel College, Toronto.

The Salt Sections.

I have been interested in the salt sections of Matthew, Mark, and Luke for a long time, but have never felt wholly satisfied with the explanations given. A year ago or so when I read Tyndale's New Testament I was struck with the translation 'But and if the salt have lost her saltness, what can be salted therewith?' All our translations reject this, but it seems to me that in spite of that it may be correct.

It seems to me that the difficulty comes from overlooking the possibility that the 'en tini' of Mt 5[13] may be a dative in the pregnant construction and should be rendered 'into what can it be salted?' which Tyndale has simply put into good English. Moulton and Geden in their *Greek*

Concordance list a dozen or so 'en's' as being in the pregnant construction, and it is interesting to note that Robertson in his large *Greek Grammar* illustrates the pregnant construction by the use of a verse which the concordance does not so list, and that Souter in his *Pocket Lexicon* illustrates it by yet another that is not so given in the concordance. I should like to add Mt 5^{13} to the list. We have the same use in English as 'Have you put salt in the potatoes?' or 'Have you salted the potatoes?' Tyndale's rendering not only makes good sense, but it also saves us from one of the most uncompromising statements of the impossibility of restoration after falling from grace that can be found anywhere in the New Testament. The renegade Christian is eternally doomed. But Jesus is not talking about the impossibility of restoring the worthless salt to saltness, but about the impossibility of using it in any way whatever.

Here a word may be said about the use of the salt indicated here. The commentators most often mention in the Synoptics, and especially in Mark, its purifying quality. Other uses mentioned are its help in preventing decay, and its preserving power, and that it sweetens the world and delays the date of destruction or the like. So far as Matthew is concerned at least I prefer to agree with Montefiore's comment in his *The Synoptic Gospels* that here the use of the salt is for flavouring or seasoning. It is something considered necessary for food by all civilized peoples. Food without it is flat and does not appeal to one who is used to it. This last year the villagers around here were unable to get salt, and they said they had no appetite for food and ate but very little. So the point of Matthew's saying is that salt with no saltness is of no help in improving the flavour of food. Though one cannot see the salt he can *taste* it. India is permeated with Christian ideas to-day and has become a new country with a different flavour or tone.

This brings the salt saying into conformity with the thought expressed in the figure of the light. When it is dark every one likes a light. This last year people have been unable to secure kerosene and have paid fabulous prices for it on the black market. So the figure is easily understood, as is that of the salt. When one has lighted a lamp he doesn't hide it. No one would know he had it if he did, and it would be of no use even to himself. But if he puts it on the lampstand it is helpful to all in the house. The salt is noticed by the tongue and the light by the eye and in any case the user is gratified. A city set on a hill cannot be hid and salt in food cannot be kept from the knowledge of the eater nor an open light from the one who has eyes. What can you salt with flavourless salt or what can you light up with a hid lamp? Let your light so shine not privately but openly; let your flavouring power be so evident that men will recognize your good works.

The saying as given by Lk 14^{34-35} has exactly the same point as in Matthew. Plummer, *I.C.C.*, gives the whole meaning of the saying when he says that savourless salt is of absolutely no use, but he fails to note that the current translations obscure that meaning by carrying the attention over to the impossibility of the salt getting back its lost quality. This may be a true statement in the physical world of a natural phenomenon, but few nowadays wish to accept it as true in such a bald sense in the spiritual world.

Tyndale renders Luke 'What shall be seasoned therewith?' Although Plummer rules out categorically the possibility of this being right, still for the same reasons as those given above for Matthew it seems to me that this rendering is correct and one's thought is not side-tracked by an extraneous idea. Whether the saying should follow immediately on *v.*[27] or not, as Montefiore thinks it might, is immaterial, and perhaps the two inserted parables help to illustrate the point. The man who takes up his cross must do so with the firm determination to keep on carrying it; the man who begins to build must determine to finish the structure even though it takes his last farthing; the man who sets out to war must go with the firm determination to conquer or die. The man who lays down his cross has no further testimony; the man who leaves his house without a roof is a laughing-stock; and the man who sues for peace at the very beginning is licked without a struggle. Salt that has lost its salty flavour is like all the above, of no use at all. Montefiore (*The Synoptic Gospels*) here quotes Perles, as does Klostermann on Luke in *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, to the effect that 'Neither fit for the land nor for the dunghill' is an odd sentence due to a mistranslation of the Aramaic original. The words should read, 'It is neither suitable for seasoning nor for manuring.' This agrees perfectly with the rendering of the first clause by Tyndale, 'What shall be seasoned therewith?' Literally, into what can it be seasoned? On what food or into what food can it be put to any profit?

The salt saying in Mark has given so much trouble that Montefiore closes his comment by saying, 'See also the article by W. S. Wood . . . which freely admits the great difficulty of the salt saying.' Gould in the *I.C.C.* has a long comment on Mk 9^{40-50} and the preceding verses, and it seems to me misses the meaning by starting with the assumption that salt is here a purifying agent and that it is thus connected with the fires of Gehenna which he says are a purifying force. Montefiore also takes the idea of purifying and adds it to that of seasoning which he so well stated in Matthew and Luke. But it seems one can let the fire be a destructive agent from whose flames nothing is to be rescued. (The function of Christians in the world as a purifying agency may be doubted.) However that may be it is possible the connexion between *v.*[49] and what precedes is merely that of association and that we should take 'puri' in the sense of sacrificial fire. This would be to take it in the same pregnant construction that I have argued for in the case of 'tini' in Matthew and Luke. Liddell and Scott (new edition) give an example of this both under 'pur' and 'thu-eila' 'en puri balle thueilas.' Robertson (*Greek Grammar*, 534) compares Mk 9^{49} 'puri alistheisetai' with Mt 5^{13} 'en tini alestheisetai'

and with Mk 9^{50} 'en tini auto artusete' as illustrating the instrumental. I would take the same and compare them in order to show the reasonableness of taking 'puri,' without the 'en,' in Mk 9^{49} as another instance of the dative pregnant construction. Thus we may translate 'Everyone shall be salted into sacrificial fire.' Every sacrifice to be acceptable had, according to the Old Testament, to be salted as one would not offer to God what would be unacceptable to an ordinary guest. Thus we have again in Mark also the same function for salt that we have found in Matthew and Luke in a slightly different connexion.

Ac 2^{38} and 10^{48} with other related passages in Acts offer encouragement to the thought that in Mt 3^{11} the author is using 'en' in two slightly different senses. John baptized in water from which the baptized will immediately emerge, but Jesus would baptize in Holy Spirit in which the baptized would remain (see Moffatt, *Commentary*) and He would baptize in fire from which the wicked would not emerge.

In all the Synoptics the saying about salt occurs in connexion with sacrifice; in Matthew with persecution; in Mark with a discourse on the death of Jesus and a severe method of becoming acceptable to God; in Luke with hating one's own mother and bearing one's cross. Everything is to be sacrificed for the Kingdom of Heaven.

There is the difficulty that with such an interpretation as the one given above the salt and the sacrificial fire or the sacrifice all seem to be the same thing. This is not such an insuperable barrier as it might seem at first sight, for we have exactly that same thing in other parts of the New Testament, notably in Hebrews where Jesus is considered not only the sacrifice but the priest, the temple, the veil, the sacrifice outside the city walls, etc. So that to make the disciples both the salt and the sacrifice is not stretching the possibilities unduly.

As salt was necessary for food and for sacrifice Mark continues with the relevant saying, 'Salt is good. But if salt has become not salt (analas), into what can you put it for seasoning?' Tyndale 'But if the salt be unsavoury; what shall ye salt therewith?' The salt which had become no salt would not give the sacrificial food the proper flavour nor would it make the sacrificial incense burn more brightly as good salt would. The use of 'analas' by Mark in place of 'moranthei' as used by Matthew and Luke may have been because of the different uses of salt in mind so that the two words here may not be exactly synonymous as they are usually taken to be.

Now, if we think of the disciple as a sacrifice, as we should according to Ro 12^{1}, we can see the aptness of the instruction to 'have salt in yourselves.' Without it their sacrifice, no matter how great, would be of no use. And the closing instruction, 'Live peaceably among yourselves,' follows easily the one to have salt in themselves for they had been disputing among themselves shortly before (Mk 9^{34}) as to which one of them was the greatest. But there should be no quarrel among the sacrifices as to whether the flesh, the whole burnt-offering, the cereal or the incense is the more important, for all if offered with salt were acceptable, and salt was salt whether offered in one class or another, and salt made those who ate at the common table friends among whom there should be no quarrelling, as is pointed out by Professor J. N. Davies in the *Abingdon Commentary*. Such a covenant was inviolable and so the treachery of Judas is represented, it is said, by the upsetting of the salt in the picture of The Last Supper by Leonardo da Vinci.

W. R. HUTTON.

Nowgong, Assam.

Luke x. 25–37.

Who is My Neighbour?

IN THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of August 1945 the Rev. James C. Gordon, M.A., has developed an ingenious solution for the discrepancy between the question of the lawyer: 'And who is my neighbour?' and the answer Jesus implied in the question: 'Which of these three, thinkest thou, proved neighbour unto him that fell among thieves?' Mr. Gordon suggests: 'Jesus asks us to discover who our neighbour is, not by thinking of someone who needs us but by thinking of someone who comes to us in answer to OUR need.' Thus the parable is 'a commentary on the Golden Rule.' This interpretation has much to commend it. It preserves the basic teaching of the parable about neighbourliness without going into far-fetched subtleties, and it is in keeping with that incisive quality of Jesus when dealing with theoretical arguments, since whatever doubts one may have about whom he should be neighbour to, he is unlikely to have any about who should be neighbour to him.

The question in my mind, however, is that this treatment of the parable ignores the literary solution expounded by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley [1] and which he attributes to Fiebig. According to this, the passage in question (Lk 10^{25-37}) is not in proper sequence. From a comparison of the relevant passages in Matthew (22^{34-40}) and Mark (12^{28-31}) Dr. Oesterley believes that the passage in Luke has suffered dislocation from its original context(s), and that Luke 10^{25-28} and Luke 10^{30-37} belonged to different contexts originally. The *v.*[29] is thus the evangelist's effort to harmonize the discrepancy.

A discussion of these two solutions and their respective merits by some competent N.T. scholar would be very welcome.

BERTRAM MAURA.

Nassau, N.P., Bahamas.

[1] *The Gospel Parables* [Warburton Lectures] (1936).

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.